2025 TEHAMA COUNTY

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

PRESENTED BY

Green DOT Transportation Solutions

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

PREPARED FOR

TEHAMA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

GREEN DOT
transportation solutions

PRESENTED BY

GREEN DOT TRANSPORTATION SOLUTIONS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF TABLES

TABLE OF FIGURES

0. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

0.1. INTRODUCTION

The Tehama County Transportation Commission (TCTC) is the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for Tehama County. TCTC's overall mission is to provide transportation planning for the region. To do so, the TCTC seeks to plan, communicate, and coordinate with the residents, stakeholders, and partners of Tehama County, the incorporated cities of Red Bluff, Corning, and Tehama, and Caltrans to create a balanced regional transportation system. Each RTPA is required by federal law (Title CFR 450.300, Subpart B) and State law (CA Government Code Section 65080) to conduct long-range planning to establish their region's vision and goals, and to clearly identify the region's unique transportation needs.

Creation of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) is a principal responsibility of the TCTC. A long-range planning document that acts as the basis for transportation planning in the region over a 20-year planning horizon, the RTP is a living document that is required to be updated every 4-5 years so that Tehama County maintains its eligibility for many of the State's funding programs. Each RTP update calibrates the region's needs based on changing demographics, and political, economic, and environmental conditions.

The RTP focuses on all modes of transportation including roadway, bicycle, pedestrian, transit, freight, aviation, and rail. The RTP is developed through a cooperative process between TCTC, Caltrans, Tribal governments, stakeholders, and community members. Guidance for RTP development comes from the California Transportation Commission (CTC). The CTC adopted the most recent update to the RTP Guidelines on January 26, 2024, which established the elements and development process required for the RTP. Three elements are required by statute and encompass the framework of the Plan:

- The Policy Element (Chapter 3) identifies legislative, planning, and financial and institutional issues and requirements, as well as provides a regional vision and a series of goals that are upheld by specific objective and policy statements.
- The Action Element (Chapter 4) describes the programs and actions necessary to support the County's vision. The Action Element identifies transportation projected needs for the County over the next 20 years, by each mode.
- The Financial Element (Chapter 5) identifies the current and anticipated available revenue sources to fund transportation projects and programs identified in the Action Element.

0.2. OVERVIEW OF REGIONAL VISION

The overarching regional vision for TCTC is to maintain a safe, efficient, and convenient countywide transportation system, including roadways, non-motorized systems, transit, freight, air travel, and any other applicable modes that enhance the lifestyle of the residents and meet the travel needs of people and goods moving through and within Tehama County.

Historically, the primary local and regional issues are centered around a lack of funding earmarked to maintain the integrity of existing facilities. Legislative efforts including California's Senate Bill 1 (SB 1) (2017) and the federal Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) (2021) have greatly increased the funding available to TCTC and local agencies for maintenance and development of the regional transportation network. Through a state gasoline tax and increased vehicle registration fees, SB 1 is a $52 billion transportation fund that is used exclusively for transportation purposes, including maintenance, repair and rehabilitation of roads and bridges, new bicycle and pedestrian facilities, public transportation, and planning grants. Furthermore, California was allocated $20.4 billion through the IIJA, of which $15.57 billion will be utilized for transportation.

The following goals have been established and ordered to reflect the regional importance of improving all modes of transportation in Tehama County:

- Provide and maintain a safe and efficient transportation system for the movement of people and goods within the region and connect to points beyond Tehama County
- Optimize the use of existing interregional and regionally significant roadways to improve safety, prolong functionality, and maximize return-on-investment
- Strategically improve the interregional and regionally significant roadways to keep people and freight moving safely, effectively, and efficiently
- Align financial resources to meet the highest priority transportation needs
- Practice agricultural, environmental, and resource stewardship
- Create vibrant, people-centered communities
- Provide an integrated, multimodal range of practical transportation choices
- Promote public access and awareness in the planning and decision-making process

0.3. OVERVIEW OF ACTION ELEMENT

Over 220 projects have been identified in the Action Element (Chapter 4) of this document including roadway, bridge, transit, bicycle and pedestrian, and aviation projects. The following figure shows the project needs in the region by mode.



Figure 0.1: Percentage of Projects by Mode



Figure 0.2: Percentage of Funding Needs by Mode

0.4. OVERVIEW OF FINANCIAL ELEMENT

Over $159 million has been identified in short-range transportation needs in the Tehama County region, and an additional $455 million have been identified in long-range transportation needs. The following figure summarizes the funded project needs or funding shortfall for each mode.



Figure 0.3: Funded vs Unfunded Projects by Mode

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. ABOUT THE TEHAMA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

The Tehama County Transportation Commission (TCTC) is the State-designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for Tehama County. The TCTC communicates and coordinates with the residents and decision-makers of Tehama County, the incorporated cities of Red Bluff, Corning, and Tehama, and Caltrans to create a balanced regional transportation system. As established by California Government Code Section 29535, the TCTC is responsible for the administration of regional, State, and federal funding for projects related to roadways, bridges, public transportation services, railways, airports, and bicycle/pedestrian facilities. The TCTC initiates planning studies, design concept development, engineering feasibility studies, environmental studies, and pursues funding sources to construct transportation improvements.

The TCTC is served by a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and the Tehama County Transit Agency Board (TCTAB) is served by the Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC). The TAC consists of representatives from Tehama County, the incorporated cities of Red Bluff, Corning, and Tehama, and Caltrans, and provides technical staff support and recommendations to the TCTC on State, regional, County and local transportation matters. The SSTAC is comprised of members appointed by the TCTAB and advises the TCTAB on transit needs, issues, and coordination of specialized transportation services.

1.2. ABOUT THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

1.2.1. *PURPOSE OF THE PLAN*

The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) is a long-range transportation plan for the County that identifies necessary transportation projects that are consistent with local land use planning, local and regional goals, and State and federal goals. In addition to moving people and goods, the transportation system also influences patterns of growth, economic activity, and access to housing, jobs, recreation, and critical services. State legislation requires that the statewide transportation network supports Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emission reduction, transportation electrification, climate resilience, and improved public health, mobility, equity, and air quality outcomes.

As the Regional Transportation Planning Agency for Tehama County, TCTC is required to update the RTP in conformance with the California Transportation Commission's Regional Transportation Guidelines every four to five years. The RTP serves as a blueprint to guide transportation investments in the County that will help to achieve local, State, and federal goals, with projects that are financially constrained to the local, State, and federal revenues anticipated over a 20-year period. Modes of transportation covered in the RTP include roadways, bridges, bicycle paths/lanes, sidewalks, crosswalks, bus stops, airports and goods movement.

Some of the key functions of the RTP are to:

- Provide an assessment of the current modes of transportation and examine the potential for new travel options within the region.
- Identify projected growth areas and future improvements for travel and goods movement.
- Identify and document specific actions necessary to address the region's mobility and accessibility needs and establish short-term and long-term goals to facilitate these actions.
- Identify necessary transportation improvements to support the development of the Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP), State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), Interregional

Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP), and facilitation of the National Environment Protection Act (NEPA) integration process and identification of project purpose and need.

- Employ performance measures that will gauge the effectiveness of the transportation improvement projects in meeting the intended goals.
- Promote consistency with other transportation plans managed by other federal, State, local and Tribal governmental agencies.
- Provide a forum for participation and cooperation among agencies and facilitate partnerships to address transportation issues that transcend geographic and agency boundaries.
- Include federal, State, and local agencies, Tribal Governments, the public, and elected officials in discussions and decision-making early in the transportation planning process.

The previous RTP for Tehama County was completed in 2019 and amended in 2020. The TCTC prepared this 2025 RTP update based on the California Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines (RTP Guidelines) which were updated and adopted by the California Transportation Commission (CTC) on January 26, 2024.

1.2.2. *REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN ELEMENTS*

This RTP is organized into five chapters:

- The Introduction (Chapter 1) includes an overview of the regional vision, action, and financial element, TCTC, the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), RTP planning requirements and the planning process.
- The Existing Conditions Chapter (Chapter 2) describes the existing setting, demographics, socioeconomic conditions, and transportation system including streets and roads, public transit, active transportation, aviation, and goods and freight movement.
- The Policy Element (Chapter 3) describes transportation issues in the region, identifies and quantifies regional needs expressed within both short- and long-range frameworks, and maintains internal consistency with the Financial Element fund estimates. Related goals, objectives, and policies are provided along with performance indicators and measures.
- The Action Element (Chapter 4) identifies projects that address the needs and issues for each transportation mode in accordance with the Policy Element.
- The Financial Element (Chapter 5) identifies current and anticipated revenue sources and funding strategies available to fund the planned transportation projects identified in the Action Element. The intent is to define realistic funding constraints and opportunities.

California Government Code Section 65080 requires that RTPs include, at a minimum, the Policy Element, Action Element and the Financial Element.

1.3. RTP PLANNING PROCESS

1.3.1. *FEDERAL PLANNING REQUIREMENTS*

Federal requirements for the development of RTPs in non-Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO) areas are directed at states and Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) as specified in 23 CFR 450.202.

The development of the RTP should correspond to Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which ensures that all people have equal access to the transportation planning process and that all people, regardless of their race, sexual orientation, or income level will be included in the decision-making process.

Federal Clean Air Act conformity requirements pursuant to the Amendments of 1990, apply in all nonattainment and

maintenance areas. This requirement ensures that federal funding and approval are given to transportation plans, programs and projects that are consistent with the air quality goals established by State Improvement Plans. In California, as designated under federal and state law, the California Air Resources Board calculates the Motor Vehicle Emission Budget based on emissions inventory and control measures in the State Improvement Plan.

The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, Sec. 12132. ensures that no qualified individual with a disability shall, by reason of such disability, be excluded from participation in or be denied the benefits of services, programs, or activities of a public entity, or be subjected to discrimination by any such entity.

The Rehabilitation Act, Section 504 states that "no qualified individual with a disability in the United States shall be excluded from, denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under" any program or activity that either receives Federal financial assistance or is conducted by any Executive agency.

Other federal requirements regarding RTPs include the consideration of the following federal planning outcomes:

- Support economic vitality of the nonmetropolitan area, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency.
- Increase safety of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users.
- Increase security of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users.
- Increase accessibility and mobility of people and freight.
- Protect and enhance the environment, promote energy conservation, improve quality of life, and promote consistency between (regional) transportation improvements and State and local planned growth and economic development patterns.
- Enhance integration and connectivity of the transportation system, across and between modes, for people and freight.
- Promote efficient system management and operation.
- Emphasize preservation of the existing transportation system.
- Improve the resiliency and reliability of the transportation system and reduce or mitigate stormwater impacts of surface transportation.
- Enhance travel and tourism.

1.3.2. *STATE PLANNING REQUIREMENTS*

Caltrans provides guidelines to MPOs and RTPAs to develop their RTPs. The RTP Guidelines were updated in 2024 to ensure that RTPs continue to adhere to current State policies that were updated or developed since the previous 2017 RTP Guidelines. RTPAs are encouraged to consider the following when developing their RTPs:

- Alignment with performance measurements and asset management.
- Alignment with goals and policies for the State's Climate Action Plan for Transportation Infrastructure (CAPTI).
- Alignment with Complete Streets policies and practices.
- Adaptation of the regional transportation system to climate change through use of modeling tools that predict climate change impacts, including integrated transportation and land use decision making that can generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reduction and increased carbon storage.

1.3.3. *COORDINATION WITH OTHER PLANS AND STUDIES*

During development of the 2025 RTP update, existing plans, documents, and studies addressing transportation in Tehama

County were reviewed to ensure the RTP's consistency with relevant planning documents in Tehama County. These documents include but are not limited to:

- Tehama County Short Range Transit Plan (2023)
- California Transportation Plan (2050)
- Tehama County Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan (2021)
- City of Red Bluff Circulation Element (1991)
- Tehama County Safety, Secondary Access, Community Planning & Evacuation Routing Study (2024)
- City of Corning General Plan (2014-2034)
- Tehama County Regional Transportation Plan (2019)
- Tehama County Active Transportation Plan – Pedestrian/ Bicycle Plan (2019)
- Tehama County General Plan Circulation Element (2009-2029)
- City of Tehama Community Transportation Plan (2023)
- Regional Transportation Plans from adjacent RTPAs and MPOs

1.3.4. *CLIMATE CHANGE AND ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY*

Global climate change is driven by the release of GHGs like carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride into the atmosphere, which trap heat and raise temperatures near the Earth's surface. Motor vehicles are major contributors to carbon dioxide emissions and, consequently, to overall GHG emissions. In fact, the California Air Resources Board GHG emissions inventory for 2022 shows that transportation is the largest economic sector contributor to California's GHGs, responsible for approximately 39% of California's total GHG emissions.

Rural RTPAs like TCTC have a unique set of challenges compared to urbanized areas to reduce regional transportation related GHG emissions. Lower land use densities, limited transit options, and higher per household vehicle miles traveled contribute to challenges to reduce these emissions. More efficient vehicles and low-carbon fuels present the highest payoff for rural counties to reduce transportation related carbon dioxide emissions, however transportation policies, programs, capital improvements, and multi-modal infrastructure are also crucial components to address GHG emissions. The Caltrans RTP Guidelines recommend that rural RTPAs strive to incorporate strategies to reduce their GHG emissions during their planning process.

1.3.5. *TRANSPORTATION/LAND USE INTEGRATION*

This 2025 RTP update is consistent with the Tehama County General Plan Circulation Element which covers the circulation factors that play a major role in the daily life of Tehama County residents. The primary goal of the General Plan Circulation Element is to provide a safe, reliable, accessible, cost-effective, and efficient transportation system that is consistent with socioeconomic and environmental needs within Tehama County. The intersection of transportation and land use has been well-studied in transportation planning literature, as much of it explores the influence of transportation facilities and networks on urban and rural development. Transportation investments can also have influential impacts on the natural environment, including air and water quality, climate change, natural habitats and wildlife, and the preservation of open spaces. Addressing the linkage between transportation and land use is crucial to meeting TCTC's goals and ensuring that the development of this RTP update leads to transformative transportation programs and projects.

1.3.6. *PARTICIPATION AND COORDINATION*

The RTP is the result of a broad and collaborative planning process, involving many stakeholders ranging from government agency representatives, Native American Tribal governments, private businesses, advocacy groups, community-based organizations, and the public. Public and private entities help shape the RTP through their understanding of the County's needs related to transportation, as well as the local economy, public health, recreation, emergency operations, environmental quality, and other constraints and opportunities related to the transportation network. Throughout the development of the RTP, local stakeholder groups were provided information about the project and were solicited for input via the TCTC website, email notifications, and presentations at TCTC meetings. Informational letters were sent to neighboring counties' transportation planning agencies and local Native American Tribal governments to inform them of the planning process and invite them to provide input on regional transportation needs and potential projects. The community was also invited to learn about the RTP and provide input on transportation needs at two different community meetings and via a project website. Information about the public review period was also circulated in print and digital news media through the Red Bluff Daily News and the Corning Observer. For more information on community engagement, see **Appendix B**.

The following list includes some of the stakeholders specifically invited to be involved throughout the planning process:

- Social Services Transportation Advisory Council
- Caltrans District 2
- City of Red Bluff
- City of Tehama
- City of Corning
- Paskenta Band Nomlaki Indians
- Susanville Indian Rancheria
- Greenville Rancheria
- Red Bluff Chamber of Commerce
- Corning Chamber of Commerce
- Butte County Association of Government
- Shasta Regional Transportation Agency
- Red Bluff Parks and Recreation
- Chico State Ecological Reserve
- California Highway Patrol – Northern Division
- Lassen Volcanic National Park
- Glenn County Transportation Commission
- Cal Fire - Tehama Glenn Unit
- Pacific Gas and Electric
- Tehama County Sheriff's Office

For the full stakeholder list, see **Appendix A**.

1.3.7. *COORDINATION WITH NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS*

Thorough coordination with local Tribal governments is critical to ensure that the RTP is a collaborative document that reflects the needs of Tribal communities. Within the purview of the California RTP Guidelines (2024) is the involvement of Native American Tribal governments in the development of the RTP. The RTP project team coordinated with the Tribes included under the Native American Heritage Commission's list of Tribes in Tehama County (Table 1.1). Although Greenville Rancheria and Susanville Rancheria are situated in other counties, offices for medical and dental services that serve Tribal members are located within Tehama County in the City of Red Bluff. Tribes were contacted directly via written and email correspondence to solicit input on the development of the Plan (**Appendix A**). Tribes were also contacted to solicit input during the Public Review period for the Plan and CEQA Environmental Negative Declaration review process.

Table 1.1: Tribal Contact List

Tribal Contact List		
Tribe	**Contact Name**	**Mailing Address**
Paskenta Band of Nomlaki Indians	Lynn Siedshlag, Director of Engineering and Development	22580 Olivewood Dr, Corning, Ca 96021
Paskenta Band of Nomlaki Indians	Tad Williams, Grants Development	22580 Olivewood Dr, Corning, Ca 96021
Greenville Rancheria	Kyle Self, Tribal Chairman	PO Box 279, Greenville, CA 95947
Greenville Rancheria	Patty Allen CFO/ICWA Designated Agent	PO Box 279, Greenville, CA 95947
Susanville Rancheria	Wanda Brown, Human Resources	795 Joaquin Street Susanville CA 96130

1.3.8. *COORDINATION WITH THE CALIFORNIA STATE WILDLIFE ACTION PLAN*

The goals identified in the Policy Element (Chapter 3) of this Plan consider stressors identified in the State Wildlife Action Plan (SWAP), which divides the State into separate conservational provinces that are further broken into subzones called ecoregions. Tehama County crosses through the Central Valley and Sierra Nevada Province, the North Coast and Klamath Province, and the Cascades and Modoc Plateau Province. In the Central Valley and Sierra Nevada Province, Tehama County is classified within the Great Valley and Sierra Nevada Foothills ecoregions; in the North Coast and Klamath Province, Tehama County is classified within the Northern California Interior Coast Ranges ecoregion and the Northern California Coast Ranges ecoregion; in the Cascades and Modoc Plateau Province, Tehama County is classified within the Southern Cascades ecoregion. The SWAP identifies sensitive species, habitat stressors, and suggested conservation goals and actions for each of the ecoregions in California. According to the SWAP, major stressors within Tehama County are:

- Annual and perennial non-timber crops
- Climate change
- Commercial and industrial areas
- Dams and water management/use
- Housing and urban areas
- Fire and fire suppression
- Invasive plants/animals
- Livestock, farming and ranching
- Logging and wood harvesting
- Roads and railroads
- Renewable energy
- Utility and service lines

To view the excerpts from the SWAP related to stressors and sensitive species in Tehama County, see **Appendix B.**



FIGURE 1.1: TRIBAL TERRITORIES IN TEHAMA COUNTY

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

2. EXISTING CONDITIONS

2.1. SETTING

Tehama County is situated in the northern Sacramento Valley, approximately halfway between the City of Sacramento and the State of Oregon. Tehama County is illustrated in Figure 2.1. The County is bound by Shasta County to the north, Trinity and Mendocino counties to the west, Glenn and Butte counties to the south, and Plumas County to the east. The County is approximately 2,950 square miles and 1,887,807 acres.

The topography consists of rolling foothills, fertile valleys, flat-topped buttes, and vast rangelands. Tehama County is bisected by the Sacramento River Valley and contains large swaths of land that are part of national forests. The western boundary of Tehama County is situated in the Pacific Coast Mountain Range, and the eastern boundary of the County is in the Cascade Mountains. Elevations range from 341 feet in Red Bluff to 9,235 feet at the peak of Brokeoff Mountain.

2.2. POPULATION TRENDS

2.2.1. *HISTORICAL POPULATION*

The historical and projected future populations of Tehama County are shown in Figure 22. Between 2000 and 2010, there was a 12% increase, resulting in a population of 63,505 as of 2010. The population continued to gradually increase until the year 2022, when it reached a peak of 65,484 residents. The Department of Finance (DOF) County Population projections (2020-2070) anticipate population to increase to 68,717 by the year 2045.



Figure 2.1: Historical and Forecasted Population



FIGURE 2.2: LOCATION MAP

2.3. DEMOGRAPHICS

2.3.1. *AGE OF POPULATION*

According to the 2022 American Community Survey (ACS) 5-Year Estimates, as of 2022, Tehama County had a total population of 65,484. Table 2.1 shows the population spread among six different age categories. The age group with the highest population is 35–59-year-olds (28.1% of the population) followed by those aged 5-19 (20.4% of the population) and by those aged 60-74 (20.0 % of the population). The aging population in Tehama County will likely result in an increased need for transit and dial-a-ride services in the future.

Table 2.1: Existing Age of Population

Existing Age of Population							
	Total Pop.	**Under 5**	**Ages 5-19**	**Ages 20-34**	**Ages 35-59**	**Ages 60-74**	**Ages 75+**
City of Red Bluff	14,576	862	3,903	2,444	4,325	2,152	890
City of Corning	8,196	555	1,661	2,234	2,184	1,248	314
City of Tehama	421	10	73	36	163	86	53
Unincorporated County	42,291	2,344	7,489	6,881	11,742	9,625	4,210
Total Tehama County	**65,484**	**3,771**	**13,126**	**11,595**	**18,414**	**13,111**	**5,467**

Source: 2022 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

2.3.2. *DEMOGRAPHICS*

As seen in Table 2.2, the Tehama County population is predominantly White (65.2%), but there is also a significant Hispanic or Latino population in Tehama County (26.9%). Asian residents make up 1.9% of the County, followed by Black or African American residents, which make up 0.9% of the County population. The American Indian/Alaskan Native population makes up 0.8% of the County's population, which includes members of the Paskenta Band of Nomlaki Indian Tribe. The ACS also utilizes "Other" to capture populations that may not fit within those listed below, which accounts for 4.3% of the population.

Table 2.2: Race and Ethnicity

Race and Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	**Number**	**Percent**
White	42,716	65.2%
Black or African American	565	0.9%
American Indian or Alaskan Native	524	0.8%
Asian	1,225	1.9%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	18	0.0%
Hispanic or Latino	17,585	26.9%
Other	2,851	4.3%
Total County Population	**65,484**	**100.0%**

Source: 2022 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

2.4. SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS

2.4.1. *INCOME AND POVERTY*

Figure 23 shows the household income distribution for Tehama County and the County's three incorporated cities, City of Red Bluff, City of Corning, and City of Tehama. The household income distributions for California and United States are included below for comparison. The largest income group for the County, City of Red Bluff, and City of Corning is the $50,000 to $74,999 income bracket. The largest income group for the City of Tehama is slightly higher, falling in the $75,000 to $99,999 income bracket. The proportion of Tehama County households in the lower income brackets, especially households who make between $10,000 and $24,999 annually, are greater than the State and national averages.

Table 2.4: Poverty Level

Poverty Level			
Place	**Total Population**	**Population with Poverty Status**	**Percent Below Poverty Level**
Tehama County	64,591	9,344	14.5%
California	38,307,718	4,670,324	12.2%
United States	325,521,470	40,951,625	12.6%

Source: 2022 American Community Survey 1-Year Estimates

According to the 2022 American Community Survey 1-Year Estimates, 14.5% of Tehama County residents were living below the poverty threshold in 2022 (Table 2.4). This is slightly higher than the State and national poverty rates.

Table 2.3: Median Household Income

Median Household Income						
Income	**City of Red Bluff**	**City of Corning**	**City of Tehama**	**Tehama County**	**California**	**United States**
Less than $10,000	7.6%	6.8%	3.5%	5.9%	4.4%	4.9%
$10,000 to $14,999	6.5%	2.3%	9.4%	6.0%	3.2%	3.8%
$15,000 to $24,999	11.5%	6.4%	6.9%	7.9%	5.6%	7.0%
$25,000 to $34,999	11.0%	17.8%	12.9%	10.8%	6.0%	7.4%
$35,000 to $49,999	15.2%	11.5%	15.3%	11.5%	8.7%	10.7%
$50,000 to $74,999	22.3%	23.4%	14.9%	18.0%	13.7%	16.1%
$75,000 to $99,999	10.4%	16.9%	18.3%	13.2%	12.0%	12.8%
$100,000 to $149,999	9.1%	10.0%	14.9%	14.5%	17.8%	12.1%
$150,000 to $199,999	3.3%	4.5%	1.5%	5.9%	10.7%	8.8%
$200,000 or more	3.0%	0.4%	2.5%	6.2%	17.0%	11.4%
Median Income	**$47,367**	**$54,766**	**$53,750**	**$59,029**	**$91,905**	**$75,149**

Source: 2022 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

2.4.2. *MAJOR EMPLOYERS*

As of August 2024, there were 25,050 people employed in Tehama County out of a labor force population of 26,830. Major employers in the County include County government positions, educational institutions, and the health-care industry.

Table 2.5: Major Employers

Major Employers		
Employer Name	**Location**	**Industry**
Antelope Elementary School District	Red Bluff	Schools
Bell-Carter Foods	Corning	Olives (whls)
Cal Fire	Red Bluff	Fire Departments
Home Depot	Red Bluff	Home Centers
Pactiv	Red Bluff	Packaging Materials-Manufacturers
Petro Travel Ctr	Corning	Truck Stops & Plazas
Precision Towing & Recovery	Red Bluff	Wrecker Service
Raley's	Red Bluff	Grocers-Retail
RBHC	Red Bluff	Convalescent Homes
Red Bluff High School	Red Bluff	Schools
Red Bluff Union High School District	Red Bluff	School Districts
RV Park At Rolling Hllls Casino	Corning	Recreational Vehicle Parks
Sierra Pacific Industries	Corning	Lumber-Manufacturers
Sierra Pacific Industries	Red Bluff	Lumber-Manufacturers
Sierra Pacific Windows	Red Bluff	Windows
St Elizabeth Community Hospital	Red Bluff	Hospitals
Tehama County Coroner	Red Bluff	Government Offices-County
Tehama County Department of Education	Red Bluff	County Government-Education Programs
Tehama County Health Svc	Red Bluff	County Government-Public Health Programs
Tehama County Health Svc Agcy	Red Bluff	Government Offices-County
Tehama County Health Svc Agcy	Red Bluff	County Government-Mental Health Services
Tehama County Mental Health	Red Bluff	Government Offices-County
Tehama County Sheriff/Records	Red Bluff	Government Offices-County
Tehama County Social Svc Dept	Red Bluff	Government Offices-County
Walmart Distribution Ctr	Red Bluff	Distribution Centers (whls)

Source: https://labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/majorer/majorer.asp, March 2024

2.4.3. *EMPLOYMENT CHARACTERISTICS*

Table 2.6 displays employment characteristics of Tehama County from the 2022 ACS 5-Year Estimates, which showed a 7.4% unemployment rate in the county, slightly higher than the State average (6.4%). Of the population 16 years and older in Tehama County (51,596), only 53.6% are actively participating in the labor force, which is significantly lower than the labor force participation rate of the State (63.8%).

Table 2.6: Employment Characteristics

Employment Characteristics			
Geographic Area	**Population 16 years and over**	**Labor Force Participation Rate**	**Unemployment Rate**
City of Red Bluff	10,855	53.6%	8.7%
City of Corning	6,244	59.9%	3.6%
City of Tehama	345	52.5%	1.1%
Tehama County	51,596	53.6%	7.4%
California	31,601,862	63.8%	6.4%
United States	266,411,973	63.5%	5.3%

Source: 2022 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

2.4.4. *EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT*

As shown in Table 2.7, Tehama County residents have a lower rate of higher educational attainment than the California and United States averages. Only 14.9% of Tehama County residents have a Bachelor's degree or higher, in comparison to 34.1% of California residents and 33.0% of U.S. residents.

Table 2.7: Educational Attainment 18 Years and Over

Educational Attainment 18 Years and Over				
Geographic Area	**Less than High School**	**High School**	**Some College or Associate's Degree**	**Bachelor's Degree or Higher**
Tehama County	14.0%	36.8%	34.3%	14.9%
California	14.6%	22.3%	29.0%	34.1%
United States	10.5%	27.2%	29.3%	33.0%

Source: 2022 American Community Survey 1-Year Estimates

2.5. DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES

Identifying disadvantaged communities in the County is important when applying for competitive funding from federal and State programs. One notoriously competitive State grant program is the California Transportation Commission's Active Transportation Program. According to the Active Transportation Program Cycle 7 guidelines, a disadvantaged community can be defined through the resources described in the following sections.

2.5.1. *CLIMATE AND JUSTICE ECONOMIC SCREENING TOOL*

This is a new tool developed by the federal Justice40 Initiative, which includes several factors that could determine a community's status as a disadvantaged community. A census tract may qualify as disadvantaged if it meets the scoring threshold in at least one of the tool's ten disadvantaged community categories (climate change, energy, health, housing, legacy pollution, transportation, water and wastewater, workforce development, Tribal overlap, and neighboring disadvantaged tracts). All Eleven of the census tracts in Tehama County qualify as disadvantaged using the CJEST.

2.5.2. *UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION EQUITABLE TRANSPORTATION COMMUNITY EXPLORER*

This is a new tool developed by the federal Justice40 Initiative. The tool calculates an overall disadvantage component score based upon five metrics: climate disaster and risk burden, environmental burden, health vulnerability, social vulnerability, and transportation insecurity. Within Tehama County, 64% of census tracts were identified as disadvantaged using this tool. Three metrics make up the transportation insecurity component: transportation access, transportation cost burden, and traffic safety. The County scores as a disadvantaged community in all three of the transportation metrics, with an overall transportation disadvantage score of 89.7%.

2.5.3. *MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME*

A community will qualify as disadvantaged if the median household income is less than 80% of the statewide Median Household Income (MHI). Ten out of Tehama County's eleven census tracts qualify as disadvantaged communities by this measure, as shown in Table 2.8 and Figure 23.

2.5.4. *CALIFORNIA COMMUNITIES ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SCREENING TOOL 4.0*

A community will qualify as disadvantaged if it is identified as among the most disadvantaged 25% in the state according to CalEPA and based on the CalEnviroScreen 4.0. One of the eleven census tracts in Tehama County qualifies as a disadvantaged community using the CalEnviroScreen 4.0 metrics.

Table 2.8: Disadvantaged Communities – Median Household Income (MHI)

Disadvantaged Communities - Median Household Income (MHI)

Geographic Area	MHI
Tehama County	***$44,514***
Census Tract 1	***$48,522***
Census Tract 2	***$48,571***
Census Tract 3	***$46,250***
Census Tract 4	$79,000
Census Tract 5	***$35,647***
Census Tract 6	***$34,773***
Census Tract 7	***$28,362***
Census Tract 8	***$47,661***
Census Tract 9	***$43,347***
Census Tract 10	***$49,017***
Census Tract 11	***$46,739***
California	$75,235

*DAC defined as 80% California's MHI, or $60,188
Source: 2019 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates



FIGURE 2.3: MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME MAP

2.5.5. *HEALTHY PLACES INDEX*

The Healthy Places Index combines 25 community health characteristics, like access to healthcare, tree canopy coverage, and access to a vehicle, and generates a composite community health score for each county and census tract in the State. The higher the score, the healthier the community conditions. A county or census tract must be in the 25th percentile or below to qualify as a disadvantaged community. Overall, Tehama County qualifies as disadvantaged, with an HPI score of 21.4, meaning nearly 80% of all counties in California have better community health conditions. Table 2.9 shows that six of the eleven census tracts in Tehama County qualify as disadvantaged under this definition.

Table 2.9: Disadvantaged Communities – Healthy Places Index (HPI)

Disadvantaged Communities - Healthy Places Index (HPI)	
Geographic Area	**HPI Score**
Tehama County	***21.4 percentile***
Census Tract 1	***21.8 percentile***
Census Tract 2	34.6 percentile
Census Tract 3	27.7 percentile
Census Tract 4	52.7 percentile
Census Tract 5	30.5 percentile
Census Tract 6	***21.2 percentile***
Census Tract 7	***14.7 percentile***
Census Tract 8	***23.4 percentile***
Census Tract 9	***24.5 percentile***
Census Tract 10	30.3 percentile
Census Tract 11	***18.4 percentile***

*DAC If Census Tract is in 25th percentile or less.
Source: California Healthy Places Index

2.5.6. *NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM*

A community will qualify as disadvantaged if at least 75% of public school students in an area are eligible to receive free or reduced-price meals (FRPM) under the National School Lunch Program. Applicants using this measure must demonstrate how the project benefits the school students in the project area and the project must be located within two miles of the school(s) represented by this criterion. Of Tehama County's 39 schools, 23 of them have at least 75% FRPM eligibility (Table 2.10).

2.5.7. *TRIBAL COMMUNITIES AND COMMUNITIES WITHOUT DATA*

Projects located within Federally Recognized Tribal Lands (typically within the boundaries of a Reservation or Rancheria) are considered disadvantaged communities, as are areas that lack accurate Census or CalEnviroScreen data such as those in small neighborhoods or unincorporated areas.

Table 2.10: Disadvantaged Communities – Free or Reduced-Price Meal Eligibility

Disadvantaged Communities - Free or Reduced-Price Meal Eligibility				
District Name	**School Name**	**Enrollment (K-12)**	**Free/Reduced Eligible (Count)**	**Free/Reduced Eligible (%)**
Tehama County Department of Education	***Tehama Oaks High***	***20***	***20***	***100%***
Evergreen Union	***Evergreen Community Day School (K-5)***	***2***	***2***	***100%***
Evergreen Union	***Evergreen Community Day School (5-8)***	***1***	***1***	***100%***
Corning Union Elementary	***Rancho Tehama Elementary***	***98***	***84***	***86%***
Corning Union Elementary	***Columbia Academy***	***7***	***6***	***86%***
Red Bluff Union Elementary	***Red Bluff Community Day***	***7***	***6***	***86%***
Corning Union High	***Centennial Continuation High***	***74***	***61***	***82%***
Corning Union Elementary	***West Street Elementary***	***314***	***256***	***82%***
Red Bluff Union Elementary	***William M. Metteer Elementary***	***477***	***388***	***81%***
Corning Union Elementary	***Olive View Elementary***	***519***	***422***	***81%***
Red Bluff Joint Union High	***Salisbury High (Continuation)***	***125***	***101***	***81%***
Corning Union Elementary	***Maywood Middle***	***527***	***418***	***79%***
Corning Union Elementary	***Woodson Elementary***	***489***	***387***	***79%***
Gerber Union Elementary	***Gerber Elementary***	***410***	***313***	***76%***
Los Molinos Unified	***Los Molinos Elementary***	***246***	***186***	***76%***
Red Bluff Union Elementary	***Jackson Heights Elementary***	***427***	***322***	***75%***
Tehama County Department of Education	Tehama eLearning Academy	117	85	73%
Antelope Elementary	Plum Valley Elementary	21	15	71%
Red Bluff Union Elementary	Vista Preparatory Academy	585	417	71%
Corning Union High	Corning High	956	657	69%
Red Bluff Union Elementary	Bidwell Elementary	397	269	68%
Tehama County Department of Education	Lincoln Street	67	45	67%
Red Bluff Joint Union High	Red Bluff High	1584	1063	67%
Antelope Elementary	Lassen-Antelope Volcanic Academy (LAVA)	94	57	61%
Corning Union High	Corning Independent Study	27	16	59%
Los Molinos Unified	Vina Elementary	79	46	58%
Evergreen Union	Evergreen Elementary	542	296	55%
Los Molinos Unified	Los Molinos High	194	103	53%
Evergreen Union	Evergreen Institute of Excellence	152	80	53%
Evergreen Union	Evergreen Middle	403	202	50%

Table 2.10 Continued

District Name	School Name	Enrollment (K-12)	Free/Reduced Eligible (Count)	Free/Reduced Eligible (%)
Richfield Elementary	Richfield Elementary	263	129	49%
Antelope Elementary	Antelope Elementary	447	208	47%
Flournoy Union Elementary	Flournoy Elementary	39	18	46%
Reeds Creek Elementary	Reeds Creek Elementary	190	82	43%
Lassen View Union Elementary	Lassen View Elementary	367	158	43%
Antelope Elementary	Berrendos Middle	236	101	43%
Tehama County Department of Education	Tehama County Special Education	46	19	41%
Kirkwood Elementary	Kirkwood Elementary	103	42	41%
Evergreen Union	Bend Elementary	97	34	35%
Total		**10,749**	**7,115**	**66%**

*Disadvantaged Community defined as 75% or more of public school students are eligible for free or reduced lunch
Source: California Department of Education Student Poverty FRPM Data

2.6. HOUSING

2.6.1. *HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS*

As seen in Table 2.11, there were an estimated 27,440 housing units in Tehama County in 2022, of which 24,623 were occupied (89.7%). Among occupied units, 16,520 units (60.2%) were owner-occupied, and 8,103 units (29.5%) were renter-occupied.

Table 2.11: Housing Characteristics

Housing Characteristics							
Place	Total Housing Units	Owner Occupied		Renter Occupied		Vacant Units	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
City of Red Bluff	6,169	2,495	40.4%	3,343	54.2%	331	5.4%
City of Corning	2,854	1,379	48.3%	1,261	44.2%	214	7.5%
City of Tehama	215	137	63.7%	65	30.2%	13	6.0%
Unincorporated County	18,202	12,509	68.7%	3,434	18.9%	2,259	12.4%
Tehama County	**27,440**	**16,520**	**60.2%**	**8,103**	**29.5%**	**2,817**	**10.3%**

Source: 2022 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

2.6.2. *HOME VALUE*

According to the 2022 ACS 5-Year Estimates, the median value of housing units in Tehama County was $290,400 in 2022, which is less than half of the California median home value of $659,300 (Table 2.12). Compared to the County, the Cities of Red Bluff, Corning, and Tehama each have lower median home values and median household incomes.

Table 2.12: Median Home Value

Median Home Value			
Geographic Area	**Median Home Value**	**Median Household Income**	**Median Household Income as % of Home Value**
City of Red Bluff	$257,900	$47,367	18.4%
City of Corning	$248,300	$54,766	22.1%
City of Tehama	$242,600	$53,750	22.2%
Tehama County	$290,400	$59,029	20.3%
California	$659,300	$91,905	13.9%
United States	$281,900	$75,149	26.7%

Source: 2022 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

2.7. TRANSPORTATION

2.7.1. *VEHICLE OWNERSHIP*

Tehama County has vehicle ownership rates that are similar to the California and national vehicle ownership rates (Table 2.13). Tehama County has a smaller proportion of households with no vehicles and a higher proportion of households with two or three (or more) vehicles. Compared to the State and the County, the City of Red Bluff and the City of Corning have a much higher proportion of households with one or fewer vehicles. It is likely that many residents of these incorporated cities do not have adequate access to a vehicle and must depend on active transportation or public transit to meet their daily needs.

Table 2.13: Vehicle Ownership for Occupied Housing Units

Vehicle Ownership for Occupied Housing Units						
Vehicles Available	**City of Red Bluff**	**City of Corning**	**City of Tehama**	**Tehama County**	**California**	**United States**
0	7.8%	9.5%	3.5%	6.2%	6.9%	8.3%
1	50.0%	37.6%	23.3%	30.0%	30.1%	32.6%
2	30.7%	22.3%	51.0%	34.7%	36.7%	37.0%
3+	11.5%	30.6%	22.3%	29.1%	26.2%	22.1%

Source: 2022 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

2.7.2. *MODE SHARE*

In Tehama County, like many rural areas, the automobile is the primary mode of transportation used. Table 2.14 shows 80.3% of Tehama County residents travel to work alone, which is slightly higher than the U.S. (72.7%) and significantly higher than the State (68.4%). The makeup of commuters who carpool in the County match the national rate (8.3%), but it is slightly lower than the State (9.5%). Alternate modes of travel, including public transit, bicycling, and walking range from 0% to 1.4%, which are considerably lower than both the state and national percentages.

Table 2.14: Commuter Mode Share

Commuter Mode Share						
Mode of Travel	**City of Red Bluff**	**City of Corning**	**City of Tehama**	**Tehama County**	**California**	**United States**
Drove Alone	82.0%	79.9%	79.2%	80.3%	68.4%	72.7%
Carpool	6.2%	7.9%	17.0%	8.3%	9.5%	8.3%
Public transportation (excluding taxicab)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	3.6%	3.6%
Walked	0.0%	1.0%	1.1%	1.4%	2.4%	2.4%
Bicycle	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.6%
Taxicab, motorcycle, or other means	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.8%	1.7%	1.5%
Worked from home	11.8%	10.5%	2.7%	9.0%	13.6%	10.8%

Source: 2022 American Community Survey 5-year Estimates

Table 2.15: Commuting Patterns

Commuting Patterns								
		Destination						
		Tehama County, CA	**Shasta County, CA**	**Butte County, CA**	**Glenn County, CA**	**Sacramento County, CA**	**Siskiyou County, CA**	**All Other Locations**
Origin	**Tehama County, CA**	9824.00	2544.00	1323.00	612.00	319.00	263.00	2373.00
	Shasta County, CA	4142.00	46707.00	1263.00	434.00	1050.00	1223.00	7209.00
	Butte County, CA	2379.00	1680.00	49318.00	2234.00	1993.00	-	13892.00
	Glenn County, CA	871.00	172.00	1423.00	4748.00	147.00	-	1385.00
	Sacramento County, CA	-	-	-	-	399976.00	-	274243.00
	Siskiyou County, CA	133.00	693.00	84.00	-	78.00	9440.00	2240.00

Source: 2021 Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics

2.7.3. *COMMUTING PATTERNS*

For employment commuting trips originating in Tehama County, the top six County destinations are illustrated by the number of commuters in Table 2.15 below. Of the 25,050 people employed in Tehama County, 39.2% work in Tehama County and 60.8% work in other counties, with the top two out-of-county destinations being Shasta County with 4,142 workers (16.5%), and Butte County with 2,379 workers (9.5%). The "All Other Locations" category aggregates commutes to all other counties outside of the top six county destinations, which accounts for 9.5% of commutes.

2.7.4. *AIR QUALITY*

Air quality is a key factor in the planning and assessment of transportation systems. Both State and federal laws impose strict regulations regarding the effects of transportation projects on air quality. Air quality standards are set at the state and federal level through the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) and National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). California Air Resources Board (CARB) is the lead agency in California for climate programs and oversees all air pollution control efforts to maintain air quality standards. CARB sets State area designations for 10 criteria pollutants (ozone, suspended particulate matter (PM10), fine suspended particulate matter (PM2.5), carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, sulfur dioxide, sulfates, lead, hydrogen sulfide, and visibility reducing particles) while the U.S. EPA sets federal area designations for 6 criteria pollutants (ozone, PM10, PM2.5, carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, and sulfur dioxide).

For effective regional management and monitoring of air quality, CARB divides California into 15 air basins. Tehama County is part of the Sacramento Valley Air Basin, and Tehama County Air Pollution Control District (TCAPCD) oversees regional air quality. Air quality in the Sacramento Valley Air Basin is generally good, due to low population density, a limited number of industrial and agricultural installations and low levels of traffic congestion. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) designated (in part) and classified Tehama County as marginal nonattainment for both the 2008 and 2015 ozone NAAQS. In 2012, the EPA designated and classified the Tuscan Buttes area as a nonattainment area for the 2008 ozone NAAQS. In February 2023, the district adopted Rule 2:3C to be in compliance with the statutory and regulatory requirements of the Nonattainment New Source Review (NNSR). The predominant source of air pollution in this area is residential wood combustion from space heating, rather than transportation. The district established the Tehama County Wood Stove Change-Out Program to provide residents with incentives to replace their inefficient stoves.

2.8. STREETS AND ROADS

Streets and roads are the primary means of local and through travel in the region, and are essential for the movement of goods and commuters, public transit, pedestrians, cyclists, and ground access for airports. The term "roadways" refers to highways, streets, and unpaved roads.

2.8.1. *CURRENT SYSTEM*

The Tehama County Road network is composed of 1,818.37 miles of lane miles, the majority of which are managed by Tehama County, the U.S. Forest Service, and the State of California (Table 2.16). Locally, Tehama County maintains 1,125.68 lane miles, the City of Red Bluff maintains 67.6 lane miles, the City of Corning maintains 38.03 lane miles, and the City of Tehama maintains 5.94 lane miles. At the State level, Caltrans maintains 206.09 miles and the State Park Service maintains 8.84 lane miles. At the federal level, the U.S. Forest Service maintains 354.27 miles, U.S. Bureau of Land Management manages 5.69 lane miles, National Park Service maintains 2.86 lane miles, and US Fish and Wildlife manages 2.82 lane miles.

Table 2.16: Roadway Mileage and Jurisdiction

Roadway Mileage and Jurisdiction		
Jurisdiction	**Lane Miles**	**% Total Miles**
City of Corning	38.03	2.1%
City of Red Bluff	67.6	3.7%
City of Tehama	5.94	0.3%
Corps of Engineers	0.55	0.0%
National Park Service	2.86	0.2%
State Highways	206.09	11.3%
State Park Service	8.84	0.5%
Tehama County	1125.68	61.9%
U.S. Bureau Of Land Management	5.69	0.3%
U.S. Fish And Wildlife	2.82	0.2%
U.S. Forest Service	354.27	19.5%
Total	**1818.37**	**100%**

Source: 2022 California Public Road Data

2.8.2. *COUNTY MAINTAINED ROADWAYS*

Roadways are classified based on functionality using criteria such as roadway design, speed, capacity, and relationship to future development and land use. Roadways can be categorized as local roads, minor collectors, major collectors, and minor arterials. Tehama County roadway classifications are illustrated in Figure 2.7. Over half of the maintained roadway miles in Tehama County are classified as local roads (Table 2.17). Roadway classifications are defined as follows:

Arterials

Arterials provide the highest level of service at the greatest speed for the longest uninterrupted distance, with some degree of access control. Speed limits typically range from 35 miles per hour (mph) to 55 mph and traffic volumes may exceed 13,000 average daily trips (ADT). Arterials connect with local and collector roadways.

Collectors

Collectors provide a less highly developed level of service at a lower speed for shorter distances by collecting traffic from local roads and connecting them with arterials. Speeds typically range from 25 mph to 45 mph and traffic volumes typically range from 2,000 to 12,000 ADT. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) further delineates collectors into major and minor collectors. Major collectors connect to arterials or regional destinations, and minor collectors generally connect local roadways to major collectors. These roads are designed to provide access for regional traffic between highways, minor collectors and local roads.

Local Roads

Local roads provide access to adjoining properties and primary residences. There is virtually no through traffic as they serve to primarily provide access to adjacent arterials and collectors. Traffic volumes are typically less than 2,000 ADT and speed limits are typically 25 mph. Local roads constitute the remaining roadway mileage not classified as arterial or collector in Tehama County.

Table 2.17: Road Miles by Functional Classification

Road Miles by Functional Classification					
	Maintained Mileage	**Minor Arterial**	**Major Collector**	**Minor Collector**	**Local Road**
Tehama County	1818.34	166.33	226.17	86.37	1268.06

Source: California Public Road Data 2022
*Includes all jurisdictions/roads within Tehama County



FIGURE 2.4: MAP OF ROADWAY CLASSIFICATIONS

Tehama County contains an interregionally and regionally significant corridor, Interstate 5 (I-5), which is the backbone of the region's transportation network, carrying upwards of 47,500 trips per day (Figure 2.7). Stretching 1,382 miles from the Canadian border to the Mexican border, I-5 acts as a major international trade gateway and freight corridor for California and the United States. It is designated by the FHWA as a Major Freight Corridor and a Corridor of the Future. I-5 bisects Tehama County, connecting the cities of Corning and Red Bluff. Residents rely on the goods movement system to bring consumer goods to the region.

Tehama County contains five State Highways: State Routes (SRs) 36, 99, 89, 172, and 32. Travel throughout Tehama County primarily occurs on the State Highway system, which is described in more detail the following sections.

State Highways

State Route 36

SR-36 is an east/west route that connects US-395 in Susanville, Lassen County near the border with Nevada to Highway 101 near Eureka in Humboldt County. West of Red Bluff, SR-36 provides access to federal recreational lands and serves as an alternate route to California's northern coastal areas. East of Red Bluff, SR-36 provides access to Lake Almanor, Lassen Volcanic National Park, and the City of Susanville. Within Tehama County, the Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) on SR-36 is highest in the City of Red Bluff at nearly 20,000 vehicles per day.

State Route 99

SR-99 is a critical north/south route in California for the movement of people and goods. SR-99 parallels I-5 through California's Central Valley and connects Butte and Tehama Counties. SR-99 is the primary connection to the City of Chico in Butte County. SR-99 begins at SR-36 in Red Bluff and terminates at I-5 near Wheeler Ridge in Kern County. The nation relies heavily on this system for access to agricultural products. Traffic volumes on SR-99 are highest in Sacramento, with over 230,000 vehicles using some locations of SR-99 daily. In Tehama County, AADT on SR-99 ranges from about 8,100 to 14,500 vehicles daily.

State Route 89

SR-89 is a north/south route that begins at US-395 in Mono County, runs northwest through Tehama County and Lassen Volcanic National Park, and eventually terminates at the intersection with I-5 in Siskiyou County near the base of Mount Shasta. SR-89 is an important corridor for communities in the Sierra Nevada region and connects Reno and the east-central portion of California to I-5 in Northern California and connects to Oregon. SR-89 accommodates up to nearly 17,000 vehicles per day in some locations, however, it has low travel rates within Tehama County.

State Route 172

SR-172 is an east/west loop route that begins at in Mineral at the SR-36 junction and travels southeast through the community of Mill Creek and provides access to Lassen National Forest. The route is approximately 9 miles long and ends in Morgan Springs at the junction of SR-36/89. Although there has been some increase in AADT, rates of travel along SR-172 are still relatively lower than other State Routes in the County.

State Route 32

SR-32 is an east/west route that begins at I-5 in Orland in Glenn County and runs through the Sacramento Valley into Chico in Butte County before heading east into the Sierra Foothills. Where it then runs through eastern Tehama County and portions of Lassen National Forest before terminating at the SR-36/89 junction. In Tehama County, the AADT ranges from 1,100 to 1,550 vehicles per day.

2.8.3. *PAVEMENT CONDITIONS*

The Pavement Condition Index, or PCI, is a numerical rating system used to evaluate the general condition of pavement on a roadway. As PCI decreases, costs to maintain the roadway increase at an exponential rate. Roads are rated on a scale of 100 to 0, with 100 being "best" and 0 being "worst." Table 2.18 denotes roadway PCI in Tehama County.

The California Statewide Local Streets and Roads Needs Assessment has reported Tehama County's average PCI to be 50 in 2020, putting the region's roadways in the "poor" category which is a slight decrease from the PCI in 2018 (Table 2.18).

Table 2.18: Pavement Condition Index (PCI)

Pavement Condition Index (PCI)						
Agency	**2012 PCI**	**2014 PCI**	**2016 PCI**	**2018 PCI**	**2020 PCI**	**Change**
Tehama County	***65***	***62***	***53***	***54***	***50***	-1.61%
Legend	***Good to Excellent (71-100)***	***At Risk (51-70)***	***Poor (25-50)***	***Failed (0-25)***		

Source: California Statewide Local Streets and Roads Needs Assessment

2.8.4. *BRIDGES*

There are 304 bridges within the County and incorporated cities. As shown in Table 2.19, a sufficiency rating value is assigned to each bridge; bridges with sufficiency ratings less than 80 and above 50 are considered eligible for rehabilitation and bridges with a sufficiency rating under 50 are considered structurally deficient or functionally obsolete and require replacement. The average sufficiency rating reported by Tehama County decreased from 74 to 72 between 2012 and 2020. Of the 304 bridges in Tehama County, 96 are eligible for rehabilitation and 59 are eligible for replacement. As of 2020, the estimated cost for bridge needs in the County was $172 million. Maintaining bridges for effective and efficient movement of people and goods is crucial to mobility and the regional economy.

Table 2.19: Bridge Sufficiency Rating (SR)

Bridge Sufficiency Rating (SR)					
	2012	**2014**	**2016**	**2018**	**2020**
Number of Bridges	309	309	305	305	304
Average SR	74	74	76	76	72
Structures with SR <= 80	91	91	96	96	96
Structures with SR <= 50	56	56	47	47	59
Total Bridge Need (Millions)	$136	$136	$159	$178	$172

Source: California Local Streets & Roads Needs Assessment 2012-2020

2.8.5. *TRAFFIC VOLUMES*

Traffic volumes indicate the utilization of roadway facilities. Hourly or daily levels of utilization can then be evaluated relative to the ability of a particular roadway to accommodate traffic, yielding an assessment of the quality of service experienced by motorists who use the facility.

Annual average daily traffic (AADT) for Interstate 5 (I-5) and the five State Highways located in Tehama County are shown in Table 2.20. AADT is calculated by dividing the total traffic volume for the year by 365 days. Analyzing AADT is necessary to present an overall picture of traffic flow, evaluate traffic trends, compute collision rates, plan and design highways, and other purposes. The highest AADT volumes in the County for 2022 occurred on I-5 in the Red Bluff and Cottonwood areas.

As shown in Table 2.20, traffic volumes decreased minimally on most highways in the County between 2018 and 2022. Traffic on I-5 experienced the greatest changes between 2019 through 2021, which was likely due to the COVID-19 Pandemic when stay-at-home guidance was in place. From 2018 to 2022, traffic on I-5 increased slightly from 0.2% to 1.7%. Of the I-5 study locations, the largest increase in AADT (9.5%) was reported at the Butte/Tehama County line on SR-32. Traffic increased at most of the study locations on SR-36, with the largest increases (6.7%) at the SR-32 Southwest junction and at the Morgan Springs junction SR-172. Traffic on SR-36 generally decreased, with the largest reported decrease on this route (2.5%) occurring on Adobe Road in Red Bluff. Traffic increases were minor on SR-89 and SR-172, ranging between 1.5% and 2.7%.

A projection rate of no more than 1% per year was used to forecast traffic conditions in Tehama County. Although the population in Tehama County is not expected to increase, the population in surrounding counties as well as freight increases are expected to cause a rise in through-traffic. Forecasted AADT for the State Highways in Tehama County are shown in Table 2.21.

Table 2.20: Historical and Existing Annual Average Daily Traffic

Historic and Existing Annual Average Daily Traffic												
Segment	2018		2019		2020		2021		2022		Avg. Annual Change	
	Back	Ahead	Back	Ahead	Back	Ahead	Back	Ahead	Back	Ahead	Back	Ahead
Interstate 5												
Glenn/Tehama County Line	-	27500	-	29000	-	26500	-	29500	-	29500	-	1.5%
Liberal Avenue	27500	28500	29000	31500	26500	29000	29500	32000	29500	30500	1.5%	1.4%
South Avenue	28500	30500	31500	32500	29000	30000	32000	33000	30500	31500	1.4%	0.7%
Corning Road	30500	31500	32500	33000	30000	30500	33000	33000	31500	33000	0.7%	1.0%
Finnell Avenue	31500	32000	33000	33000	30500	30500	33000	33500	33000	33000	1.0%	0.6%
Gyle Road	32000	30500	33000	31500	30500	29000	33500	31500	33000	31500	0.6%	0.7%
Flores Avenue	30500	30000	31500	32000	29000	29500	31500	32000	31500	32000	0.7%	1.3%
Red Bluff, South Main Street	30000	34500	32000	36000	29500	33000	32000	36000	32000	35000	1.3%	0.3%
Red Bluff, Diamond Avenue	34500	38500	36000	39500	33000	36500	36000	39000	35000	38500	0.3%	0.0%
Red Bluff, Jct. Rte. 36	38500	43500	39500	45000	36500	41500	39000	45000	38500	44000	0.0%	0.2%
North Red Bluff	38000	40500	39000	45000	35500	41500	39000	45000	35000	44000	-1.6%	1.7%
Wilcox Road	43500	43000	45000	45500	41500	41500	45000	45500	44000	44500	0.2%	0.7%
Jellys Ferry Road	43000	41000	45500	43500	41500	39000	45500	43000	44500	42500	0.7%	0.7%
Hooker Creek Road	41000	41000	43500	42500	39000	38000	43000	42000	42500	42000	0.7%	0.5%
Sunset Hills Drive	41000	41000	42500	43000	38000	38500	42000	42000	42000	40000	0.5%	-0.5%
Bowman Road	41000	46500	43000	48500	38500	45500	42000	48500	40000	47500	-0.5%	0.4%
Tehama/Shasta County Line	46500	-	48500	-	45500	-	48500	-	47500	-	0.4%	-
S.R. 32												
Butte/Tehama County Line	-	1050	-	1450	1400	1350	1350	1300	1650	1550	3.6%	9.5%
Jct. Rte. 36	1150	-	1550	560	1450	-	1350	-	1100	-	-0.9%	-

Table 2.20 Continued

Segment	2018		2019		2020		2021		2022		Avg. Annual Change	
	Back	Ahead	Back	Ahead	Back	Ahead	Back	Ahead	Back	Ahead	Back	Ahead
S.R. 36												
Shasta/Tehama County Line	-	520	-	570	-	500	-	540	-	530	-	0.4%
Bowman Road	600	550	610	1550	580	530	630	560	630	560	1.0%	0.4%
Cannon Road	550	560	560	3900	530	540	560	540	560	540	0.4%	-0.7%
Oak Knoll Drive	1500	1500	1550	4100	1450	1450	1550	1550	1550	1550	0.7%	0.7%
Mc Coy Road	3200	3800	3300	8000	3150	3700	3350	3950	3350	3950	0.9%	0.8%
Baker Road	3800	4000	3900	9700	3700	3900	3750	4150	3750	4150	-0.3%	0.8%
North Main Street	4000	7900	4100	8200	3900	7700	4150	8000	4150	7800	0.8%	-0.3%
Red Bluff, Adobe Road	12700	9600	12800	11500	12300	9300	11100	9900	11100	9900	-2.5%	0.6%
Red Bluff, Crittenden Street	9400	8100	9500	18800	9100	7900	9500	8200	9200	9200	-0.4%	2.7%
Red Bluff, Walnut Street	8100	11400	8200	18800	7900	11000	8400	11000	8400	11000	0.7%	-0.7%
Red Bluff, Oak Street	10900	18600	11000	19100	10500	18000	10900	18700	10600	18200	-0.6%	-0.4%
Red Bluff, Sacramento River Bridge	18600	18600	18800	19600	18000	18000	18400	18700	18400	18200	-0.2%	-0.4%
Red Bluff, Gilmore Road	18600	18900	18800	17800	18000	18300	18700	19000	18200	18500	-0.4%	-0.4%
Red Bluff, Jct. Rte. 5	18900	19400	19100	12400	18300	18800	19000	19500	18500	19000	-0.4%	-0.4%
Red Bluff, Chestnut Avenue	19400	17700	19600	1900	18800	17100	20700	17400	20700	17400	1.3%	-0.3%
Hoy Road	17700	12300	17800	1600	17100	11900	17700	12300	17300	12000	-0.5%	-0.5%
Jct. Rte. 99 South	12300	1850	12400	1400	11900	1800	12500	2200	12500	2200	0.3%	3.8%
Manton Road	1700	1300	1850	1050	1800	1500	1850	1550	1800	1600	1.2%	4.6%
Paynes Creek	1300	1550	1600	1050	1500	1300	1550	1350	1550	1350	3.8%	-2.6%
Mineral, Jct. Rte. 172 Southeast	1150	1100	1150	1100	1100	980	1150	930	1150	1150	0.0%	0.9%
Jct. Rte. 89 North	1100	950	1050	2150	980	980	930	930	1150	1150	0.9%	4.2%
Morgan Springs, Jct. Rte. 172 Southwest	950	900	1050	-	980	1050	930	960	1150	1200	4.2%	6.7%
Jct. Rte. 32 Southwest	900	2000	1100	430	1050	2000	960	1900	1200	2350	6.7%	3.5%
Tehama/Plumas County Line	2000	-	2150	-	2000	-	1900	-	2350	-	3.5%	-

Table 2.20 Continued

Segment	2018		2019		2020		2021		2022		Avg. Annual Change	
	Back	Ahead	Back	Ahead	Back	Ahead	Back	Ahead	Back	Ahead	Back	Ahead
S.R. 89												
Jct. Rte. 36, Plumas/Tehama County Line	-	410	-	16400	-	410	-	410	-	440	-	1.5%
Jct. Rte. 44, Lassen National Park, Teh/Sha Co Line	410	-	430	9700	410	-	410	-	440	-	1.5%	-
S.R. 99												
Butte/Tehama County Line	-	13800	-	9300	-	13900	-	14800	-	14500	-	1.0%
South Avenue	14200	8200	16800	10100	14300	8200	14300	8700	14300	8700	0.1%	1.2%
Vina Road	7600	7800	9000	10700	7700	7900	8100	8100	8000	8100	1.1%	0.8%
Sherman Street	8500	8500	10100	12000	8600	8600	8700	9100	8700	8900	0.5%	0.9%
Aramayo Way	11400	9100	13500	-	11500	9100	11800	9100	11800	9100	0.7%	0.0%
Kaufman Avenue	7900	10200	9300	190	7900	10200	8100	10800	8100	10700	0.5%	1.0%
Jct. Rte. 36	10200	-	12000	160	10200	-	10400	-	10400	-	0.4%	-
S.R. 172												
Mineral, Jct. Rte. 36	-	180	-	-	-	180	-	170	-	170	-	-1.1%
Mill Creek	180	150	190	-	180	150	170	140	200	170	2.2%	2.7%
Morgan Springs, Jct. Rte. 36	150	-	160	-	150	-	140	-	170	-	2.7%	-

Source: Caltrans Traffic Census 2018-2022

Table 2.21: Forecasted Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT)

Forecasted Annual Average Daily Traffic												
Segment	Projected Growth Rate		2027		2032		2037		2042		2047	
	Back	Ahead	Back	Ahead	Back	Ahead	Back	Ahead	Back	Ahead	Back	Ahead
Interstate 5												
Glenn/Tehama County Line	-	2%	-	32570	-	32570	-	39703	-	43835	-	48398
Liberal Avenue	2%	2%	32570	33674	32570	33674	39703	41049	43835	45321	48398	50038
South Avenue	2%	1%	33674	33107	33674	33107	41049	36571	45321	38436	50038	40397
Corning Road	1%	1%	33107	34683	33107	34683	36571	38312	38436	40266	40397	42320
Finnell Avenue	1%	1%	34683	34683	34683	34683	38312	38312	40266	40266	42320	42320
Gyle Road	1%	1%	34683	33107	34683	33107	38312	36571	40266	38436	42320	40397
Flores Avenue	1%	2%	33107	35331	33107	35331	36571	43068	38436	47550	40397	52499
Red Bluff, South Main Street	2%	1%	35331	36785	35331	36785	43068	40634	47550	42707	52499	44885
Red Bluff, Diamond Avenue	1%	0%	36785	38500	36785	38500	40634	38500	42707	38500	44885	38500
Red Bluff, Jct. Rte. 36	0%	1%	38500	46244	38500	46244	38500	51083	38500	53688	38500	56427
North Red Bluff	-2%	2%	31637	48580	31637	48580	25850	59218	23366	65382	21121	72187
Wilcox Road	1%	1%	46244	46770	46244	46770	51083	51663	53688	54298	56427	57068
Jellys Ferry Road	1%	1%	46770	44668	46770	44668	51663	49341	54298	51858	57068	54503
Hooker Creek Road	1%	1%	44668	44142	44668	44142	49341	48761	51858	51248	54503	53862
Sunset Hills Drive	1%	-1%	44142	38040	44142	38040	48761	34402	51248	32716	53862	31113
Bowman Road	-1%	1%	38040	49923	38040	49923	34402	55146	32716	57959	31113	60916
Tehama/Shasta County Line	1%	0%	49923	-	49923	-	55146	-	57959	-	60916	-
S.R. 32												
Butte/Tehama County Line	3%	5%	1913	1978	1913	1978	2571	3222	2980	4113	3455	5249
Jct. Rte. 36	-1%	-	1046	-	1046	-	946	-	900	-	856	-
S.R. 36												
Shasta/Tehama County Line	-	1%	-	557	-	557	-	615	-	647	-	680
Bowman Road	1%	1%	662	589	662	589	731	650	769	683	808	718
Cannon Road	1%	-1%	589	514	589	514	650	464	683	442	718	420

Table 2.21 Continued

Segment	Projected Growth Rate		2027		2032		2037		2042		2047	
	Back	Ahead	Back	Ahead	Back	Ahead	Back	Ahead	Back	Ahead	Back	Ahead
S.R. 36												
Oak Knoll Drive	1%	1%	1629	1629	1629	1629	1800	1800	1891	1891	1988	1988
Mc Coy Road	1%	1%	3521	4151	3521	4151	3889	4586	4088	4820	4296	5066
Baker Road	-1%	1%	3566	4362	3566	4362	3225	4818	3067	5064	2917	5322
North Main Street	1%	-1%	4362	7418	4362	7418	4818	6708	5064	6380	5322	6067
Red Bluff, Adobe Road	-2%	1%	10034	10405	10034	10405	8198	11494	7410	12080	6698	12696
Red Bluff, Crittenden Street	-1%	3%	8749	10665	8749	10665	7913	14333	7525	16616	7156	19263
Red Bluff, Walnut Street	1%	-1%	8828	10461	8828	10461	9752	9461	10250	8997	10772	8556
Red Bluff, Oak Street	-1%	-1%	10080	17308	10080	17308	9117	15653	8670	14886	8245	14156
Red Bluff, Sacramento River Bridge	-1%	-1%	17498	17308	17498	17308	15825	15653	15049	14886	14312	14156
Red Bluff, Gilmore Road	-1%	-1%	17308	17593	17308	17593	15653	15911	14886	15131	14156	14390
Red Bluff, Jct. Rte. 5	-1%	-1%	17593	18069	17593	18069	15911	16341	15131	15540	14390	14779
Red Bluff, Chestnut Avenue	2%	-1%	22854	16547	22854	16547	27859	14965	30759	14232	33961	13534
Hoy Road	-1%	-1%	16452	11412	16452	11412	14879	10321	14150	9815	13456	9334
Jct. Rte. 99 South	1%	3%	13138	2550	13138	2550	14512	3428	15252	3973	16030	4606
Manton Road	2%	3%	1987	1855	1987	1855	2423	2493	2675	2890	2953	3350
Paynes Creek	3%	-3%	1797	1159	1797	1159	2415	855	2799	734	3245	630
Mineral, Jct. Rte. 172 Southeast	0%	1%	1150	1209	1150	1209	1150	1335	1150	1403	1150	1475
Jct. Rte. 89 North	1%	3%	1209	1333	1209	1333	1335	1792	1403	2077	1475	2408
Morgan Springs, Jct. Rte. 172 Southwest	3%	4%	1333	1460	1333	1460	1792	2161	2077	2629	2408	3199
Jct. Rte. 32 Southwest	4%	3%	1460	2724	1460	2724	2161	3661	2629	4244	3199	4920
Tehama/Plumas County Line	3%	-	2724	-	2724	-	3661	-	4244	-	4920	-

Table 2.21 Continued

Segment	Projected Growth Rate		2027		2032		2037		2042		2047	
	Back	Ahead	Back	Ahead	Back	Ahead	Back	Ahead	Back	Ahead	Back	Ahead
S.R. 89												
Jct. Rte. 36, Plumas/Tehama County Line	-	2%	-	486	-	486	-	592	-	654	-	722
Jct. Rte. 44, Lassen National Park, Teh/Sha Co Line	2%	-	486	-	486	-	592	-	654	-	722	-
S.R. 99												
Butte/Tehama County Line	-	1%	-	15240	-	15240	-	16834	-	17693	-	18595
South Avenue	1%	2%	15029	9606	15029	9606	16602	11709	17449	12928	18339	14273
Vina Road	2%	1%	8833	8513	8833	8513	10767	9404	11888	9884	13125	10388
Sherman Street	1%	1%	9144	9354	9144	9354	10100	10333	10616	10860	11157	11414
Aramayo Way	1%	0%	12402	9100	12402	9100	13699	9100	14398	9100	15133	9100
Kaufman Avenue	1%	1%	8513	11246	8513	11246	9404	12422	9884	13056	10388	13722
Jct. Rte. 36	1%	-	10931	-	10931	-	12074	-	12690	-	13337	-
S.R. 172												
Mineral, Jct. Rte. 36	-	-2%	-	154	-	154	-	126	-	113	-	103
Mill Creek	2%	3%	221	197	221	197	269	265	297	307	328	356
Morgan Springs, Jct. Rte. 36	3%	-	197	-	197	-	265	-	307	-	356	-

Source: Caltrans Traffic Census 2018-2022

2.8.6. *VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED*

Vehicle miles traveled (VMT) is a general but robust measure of vehicle activity. It measures the extent of utilization of a transportation network experienced by motorists. Although it is not a good indicator of congestion, it is a great indicator of overall vehicle activity and identifies bottlenecks or high-delay "hotspot" locations. VMT is commonly applied on a per-household or per-capita basis and is a primary input for regional air quality and safety analyses. Per Senate Bill 743 (Steinberg, 2013), VMT is now the basis for transportation impact identification and mitigation under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). However, jurisdictions must also ensure consistency with current land use plans, some of which still utilize level of service (LOS) as a primary metric. Future RTP updates will be consistent with the County General Plan and will promote new developments adjacent to existing developments to reduce VMT and travel time.

VMT data is annually reported as part of the federal Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS) program. The HPMS program uses a sample-based method that combines traffic counts stratified by functional classification of roadways by volume groups to produce sample-based geographic estimates of VMT. HPMS VMT estimates are reported for each county by local jurisdiction. Population data is gathered from the California Department of Finance.

Estimates of daily VMT for Tehama County and State Highways are shown in Table 2.22. VMT decreased slightly by 0.3% in Tehama County between 2019 and 2022, although a significant increase of VMT occurred on U.S. Fish & Wildlife roadways (13.3%) and a larger increase occurred on State Park Service roadways (17.2%). A large decrease (3.6%) of VMT occurred on City of Corning roadways between 2019 and 2022.

VMT has been projected over the 20-year lifetime of the RTP in Table 2.23. A variable formula was used to forecast VMT based on the annual average change from 2019-2022. Roadway segments with minor increases or decreases in this period were projected at a matching constant rate of increase or decrease. Roadways with significant average VMT increases were projected at a higher rate of increase in proportion to VMT increases experienced between 2019 and 2022. Road segments that experienced no change between 2019 and 2022 have been projected to remain constant. Overall, VMT on Tehama County roadways are not expected to change drastically over the next 20 years.

Table 2.22: Historical and Existing Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)

Historic and Existing Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)						
Place	**Lane Miles**	**2019 Daily VMT**	**2020 Daily VMT**	**2021 Daily VMT**	**2022 Daily VMT**	**Avg. Annual Change**
City of Corning	38.03	55.91	53.48	53.97	45.85	-3.6%
City of Red Bluff	67.6	101.60	89.79	89.43	91.50	-2.0%
City of Tehama	5.94	4.06	3.95	4.06	3.73	-1.6%
Corps of Engineers	0.55	-	-	-	0.14	-
National Park Service	2.86	-	-	-	0.85	-
State Highways	206.09	1950.24	1794.61	1931.81	1914.34	-0.4%
State Park Service	8.84	0.43	0.40	0.97	0.80	17.2%
Tehama County	1125.68	468.71	462.32	515.60	462.24	-0.3%
U.S. Bureau Of Land Management	5.69	-	-	-	1.21	-
U.S. Fish And Wildlife	2.82	0.15	0.13	0.28	0.25	13.3%
U.S. Forest Service	354.27	9.88	16.89	43.96	101.95	186.4%

Source: California Public Road Data 2019-2022

Table 2.23: Forecasted Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)

Forecasted Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)						
Place	**2022 Daily VMT**	**Projected Growth Rate**	**2027 Daily VMT**	**2032 Daily VMT**	**2037 Daily VMT**	**2042 Daily VMT**
City of Corning	45.85	-3%	39.37	33.81	29.03	24.93
City of Red Bluff	91.50	-2%	82.71	74.76	67.58	61.09
City of Tehama	3.73	-2%	3.37	3.05	2.75	2.49
Corps of Engineers	0.14	0%	-	-	-	-
National Park Service	0.85	0%	-	-	-	-
State Highways	1914.34	-1%	1820.52	1731.29	1646.44	1565.75
State Park Service	0.80	5%	1.02	1.30	1.66	2.12
Tehama County	462.24	-1%	439.59	418.04	397.55	378.07
U.S. Bureau Of Land Management	1.21	0%	-	-	-	-
U.S. Fish And Wildlife	0.25	5%	0.32	0.41	0.52	0.66
U.S. Forest Service	101.95	5%	130.12	166.07	211.95	270.50

Source: California Public Road Data 2019-2022

2.8.7. *TRUCK TRAFFIC*

The truck traffic as a percentage of total traffic across the years 2018-2022 can be seen in Table 2.24. The majority of truck traffic in Tehama County occurs on I-5 and SR-99. In 2022, truck traffic relative to all traffic in the county ranged from 0.5% on SR-172 to 24.3% on I-5. The proportion of truck traffic has stayed relatively steady on I-5 and most of the County's State Highways from 2018-2022 but has fluctuated the greatest on SR-36 and SR-172.

Table 2.24: Truck Traffic as a Percentage of Total Traffic

Truck Traffic as a Percentage of Total Traffic					
Segment	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**
Interstate 5					
GLENN/TEHAMA COUNTY LINE	23.7%	24.8%	25.5%	24.3%	24.3%
LIBERAL AVE	22.5%	24.8%	22.2%	22.0%	22.0%
SOUTH AVE	21.4%	22.6%	22.2%	22.0%	22.0%
CORNING RD	22.0%	22.6%	22.2%	22.0%	22.0%
FINNELL AVE	19.7%	22.6%	22.2%	22.0%	22.0%
GYLE RD	20.7%	22.6%	22.2%	22.0%	22.0%
FLORES AVE	21.4%	22.6%	22.2%	22.0%	22.0%
RED BLUFF, SOUTH MAIN ST	19.9%	19.5%	19.8%	19.8%	19.8%
RED BLUFF, DIAMOND AVE INTERCHANGE	17.1%	19.5%	19.8%	19.8%	19.8%
RED BLUFF, JCT. RTE. 36	15.5%	16.4%	17.3%	17.6%	17.6%
NORTH RED BLUFF	17.4%	16.4%	17.3%	17.6%	17.6%
WILCOX RD	15.8%	16.4%	17.3%	17.4%	17.4%
JELLYS FERRY RD	16.0%	16.4%	17.3%	18.5%	18.5%
HOOKER CREEK RD	16.0%	16.4%	18.5%	18.6%	18.6%
SUNSET HILLS DR	17.1%	16.4%	17.6%	18.6%	18.6%
BOWMAN RD	19.1%	16.4%	20.0%	18.5%	18.5%
TEHAMA/SHASTA COUNTY LINE	15.8%	16.4%	16.7%	17.1%	14.9%
S.R. 32					
BUTTE/TEHAMA COUNTY LINE	10.2%	9.3%	9.3%	9.3%	9.3%
JCT. RTE. 36	7.6%	9.3%	9.3%	9.3%	9.3%
S.R. 36					
BOWMAN RD	3.1%	3.0%	3.0%	3.3%	3.3%
BOWMAN RD	3.1%	3.3%	3.3%	10.3%	10.3%
BAKER RD	5.9%	5.8%	5.8%	5.5%	5.5%
BAKER RD	3.1%	3.1%	3.1%	3.1%	3.1%
NORTH MAIN ST	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%

Table 2.24 Continued

Segment	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
S.R. 36					
RED BLUFF, CRITTENDEN ST	2.9%	2.9%	2.9%	2.9%	2.9%
RED BLUFF, OAK ST	1.6%	2.2%	2.2%	2.2%	2.2%
RED BLUFF, OAK ST	2.2%	1.6%	1.6%	1.6%	1.6%
RED BLUFF, JCT. RTE. 5	1.7%	1.7%	1.7%	1.7%	1.7%
RED BLUFF, JCT. RTE. 5	6.8%	6.8%	6.8%	6.8%	6.8%
RED BLUFF, CHESTNUT AVE	8.1%	8.1%	8.1%	8.1%	8.1%
HOY RD	9.5%	9.5%	9.5%	9.5%	9.5%
HOY RD	7.6%	7.6%	7.6%	7.6%	7.6%
JCT. RTE. 99 SOUTH	6.1%	6.1%	6.1%	12.3%	12.3%
MANTON RD	8.5%	9.3%	9.3%	8.0%	8.0%
PAYNES CREEK	6.5%	9.3%	9.3%	10.0%	10.0%
MINERAL, JCT. RTE. 172 SOUTHEAST	6.4%	13.7%	13.7%	11.2%	11.2%
JCT. RTE. 89 NORTH	10.1%	13.6%	13.6%	11.2%	11.2%
MORGAN SPRINGS, JCT. RTE. 172 SOUTHWEST	15.9%	13.7%	13.7%	11.2%	11.2%
JCT. RTE. 32 SOUTHWEST	20.8%	10.3%	10.3%	11.0%	8.9%
TEHAMA/PLUMAS COUNTY LINE	9.4%	10.2%	10.2%	11.0%	8.9%
S.R. 89					
JCT. RTE. 36	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%
JCT. RTE. 44, LASSEN NATIONAL PARK	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%
S.R. 99					
BUTTE/TEHAMA COUNTY LINE	7.9%	12.1%	11.0%	10.3%	10.3%
SOUTH AVE	15.3%	15.3%	20.6%	19.5%	19.5%
VINA RD	11.9%	11.9%	16.9%	16.5%	16.5%
SHERMAN ST	15.6%	15.6%	20.5%	15.4%	15.4%
KAUFMAN AVE	11.7%	11.4%	21.9%	18.0%	18.0%
KAUFMAN AVE	11.4%	11.7%	16.7%	15.8%	15.8%
JCT. RTE. 36	14.3%	14.3%	16.8%	15.5%	15.5%
S.R. 172					
MINERAL, JCT. RTE. 36	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%	0.6%	0.5%
MILL CREEK	1.4%	3.8%	3.8%	50.8%	50.8%
MORGAN SPRINGS, JCT. RTE. 36	1.4%	3.8%	3.8%	50.8%	50.8%

Source: Caltrans Traffic Census 2018-2022

2.8.8. *SAFETY*

Illustrated in Figure 2.8 is a heatmap of traffic collisions that occurred in the County from 2013 to 2023. Traffic collision data is aggregated and processed by the Transportation Injury Mapping System (TIMS), developed by UC Berkeley and uses collision data from the Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS). The most recent SWITRS data is from 2023 and provides collision information for the entire State, State Highways, and individual counties and cities. Crash data is provided for collisions resulting in injuries, fatalities, and property damage, in addition to other accident information such as whether pedestrians or bicyclists were involved, the location of the collision, weather conditions, and whether the driver was intoxicated.

Collision data for Tehama County for 2019 through 2023 is included in Table 2.25. During the 5-year study period, collisions were highest in 2021 with 325 total collisions, 13 of which (4%) were fatal. Although there were fewer collisions in 2019 (279) and 2020 (283), a much higher percentage of collisions were fatal, with 20 fatal collisions in both years (7.2% and 7.1%, respectively). In 2023, the total number of collisions decreased slightly to 258, and fatal collisions decreased slightly to 14 (5.4%).

Total collisions between 2019 and 2023 generally decreased in the incorporated cities, but City of Red Bluff experienced a slight spike in collisions (71) in 2021 and a decrease in the following years (53 collisions in 2022 and 40 collisions in 2023). The cities of Corning and Tehama did not have any collisions that resulted in a fatality or any collisions involving a bicyclist or pedestrian during 2019-2023. City of Red Bluff accounts for the majority of bicycle and pedestrian collisions within Tehama County, exceeding the number of bicycle and pedestrian collisions in the unincorporated County. In 2019, bicycle and pedestrian collisions accounted for 30% of all collisions in Red Bluff, while in that same year only 3.3% of collisions in the unincorporated County involved a bicyclist or pedestrian.

Table 2.25.: Collision History

Collision History					
Place	**Total Collisions**	**Highway Collisions**	**Fatal Collisions**	**Pedestrian Collisions**	**Bicycle Collisions**
2019					
Unincorporated County	209	108	18	5	2
City of Corning	1	0	0	0	0
City of Red Bluff	69	20	2	10	11
City of Tehama	0	0	0	0	0
Total Tehama County	**279**	**128**	**20**	**15**	**13**
2020					
Unincorporated County	220	116	17	0	1
City of Corning	3	3	0	0	0
City of Red Bluff	60	36	3	7	9
City of Tehama	0	0	0	0	0
Total Tehama County	**283**	**155**	**20**	**7**	**10**
2021					
Unincorporated County	249	113	10	5	3
City of Corning	2	1	0	0	0
City of Red Bluff	71	27	3	7	6
City of Tehama	3	2	0	0	0
Total Tehama County	**325**	**143**	**13**	**12**	**9**
2022					
Unincorporated County	209	93	17	1	0
City of Corning	1	1	0	0	0
City of Red Bluff	53	51	2	12	5
City of Tehama	4	2	0	0	0
Total Tehama County	**267**	**147**	**19**	**13**	**5**
2023					
Unincorporated County	216	89	13	4	1
City of Corning	1	1	0	0	0
City of Red Bluff	40	19	1	5	4
City of Tehama	1	1	0	0	0
Total Tehama County	**258**	**110**	**14**	**9**	**5**

Source: Berkeley TIMS



FIGURE 2.5: HEATMAP OF COLLISIONS

2.9. PUBLIC TRANSIT

The Tehama Rural Area eXpress, (TRAX) is a fixed route bus service that has both local and regional routes available along the Highway 99E & 99W corridors. Buses run on fixed schedules and are accessible at any designated bus stop or by "flagging" down a bus anywhere along the route where it is safe to stop. An overview of the existing routes is included below, and a detailed transit map is included in Figure 2.10.

Red Bluff

- Route 1 – Monday-Friday: 5 morning departures, 6 afternoon departures. Saturday: 3 morning departures, 4 afternoon departures
- Route 2 – Monday-Friday: 5 morning departures, 6 afternoon departures. Saturday: 3 morning departures, 4 afternoon departures

Corning

- Route 5 – Monday-Friday: 4 morning departures, 3 afternoon departures

Regional

- Route 3A & 3B – Regional for Red Bluff, Los Molinos, and Gerber. Monday-Friday: 5 morning departures, 4 afternoon departures. Saturday: 4 morning departures, 3 afternoon departures
- Shasta-Tehama Connect – Regional Express for Red Bluff to Anderson. Monday-Friday: 3 morning departures, 2 afternoon departures. Saturday: 3 morning departures
- Rancho Tehama Express – Regional for Red Bluff and Rancho Tehama. Wednesday and Friday: 1 morning departure, 1 afternoon departure
- Glenn County Connect – Regional for Red Bluff, Corning, and Orland. Monday-Friday: 3 morning departures, 2 afternoon departures

ParaTRAX

ParaTRAX is a curb-to-curb, demand-response service available to seniors aged 55 and older and those with disabilities in the greater Red Bluff area. Services run Monday through Friday 7:00 AM to 6:00 PM and Saturday 9:00 AM to 3:00 PM. ParaTRAX also provides ADA service to persons with disabilities along all of its fixed routes and within a 10-mile radius of a fixed route.

2.9.1. *FARES*

As of March 2021, TRAX implemented a fare-free program through funding provided by the CARES program. Tehama County Transit Agency Board (TCTAB) intends to continue using this funding to provide free transit fares to riders.

2.9.2. *RIDERSHIP*

Transit ridership had a slight increase from 2018 to 2019, then declined slightly from 2020 to 2022 from 4.2 to 3.8 passengers per revenue hour (Table 2.2). Throughout the country, the Covid-19 pandemic caused a trend of lower transit ridership levels that have continued beyond the pandemic, despite returns to pre-pandemic traffic patterns in other modes of travel.

Table 2.26: Passengers per Revenue Hour

Passengers per Revenue Hour						
Transit Mode	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**Changes from 2018 to 2022**
Demand Response	3.2	3.2	2.4	1.9	1.9	-40.6%
Bus	5	5.2	4.8	4.0	4.5	-10.0%
Total	**4.6**	**4.7**	**4.2**	**3.5**	**3.8**	**-17.4%**

Source: National Transit Database Agency Profiles 2018-2022



FIGURE 2.6: MAP OF TEHAMA COUNTY TRANSIT SERVICE

2.9.3. *SOCIAL SERVICE TRANSPORTATION PROVIDERS*

Senior Nutrition Program

The Tehama County Senior Nutrition Program is organized by the Tehama County Community Action Agency. The program allows seniors to either eat a nutritious meal in a community environment or have a meal delivered to their home. The home delivery option is only available for seniors aged 60 and older, or those who are unable to drive. This program is available Monday through Friday.

Volunteer Medical Non-Emergency Transportation Service (METS)

The volunteer Medical Transportation Service (METS) is a transportation service that utilizes volunteer drivers to transport Tehama County residents who are eligible for METS service, to and from medical appointments. The drivers are reimbursed for mileage based on the IRS rate to provide transportation to medical appointments. Reservations are required for this service. To qualify, individuals must live in Tehama County and have no other means of transportation. METS provides non-emergency medical transportation services to Shasta, Glenn, and Butte Counties and only provides service within Tehama County if the requested stop is outside of a 10-mile radius from a TRAX fixed route. Service is available Monday through Friday and reservations must be scheduled a week in advance.

ParaTrax

ParaTRAX is the complementary paratransit service offered for American Disability Act (ADA) certified disabled persons and seniors ages 65 and older. It is a demand response (dial-a-ride) program, which provides a curb-to-curb service and operates Monday through Saturday.

North Valley Services

North Valley Services offers work development, training and assessment, transportation, day activity centers, and residential care for developmentally disabled adults in Tehama, Glenn, and Lassen Counties. Clients are provided transportation seven days a week to job sites, day programs, and other locations. Transportation is provided with the use of regularly maintained buses operated by drivers that are Class B, CPR, and First Aid certified. In 2015 and 2017, North Valley Services FTA Section 5310 received grant monies for the purchase of replacement buses.

Far Northern Regional Center

The Far Northern Regional Center is a contact center with the California Department of Developmental Services. The Center serves as a fixed point of reference for individuals and families of individuals with developmental disabilities. The Center provides transportation to clients in various forms including vouchers and mileage reimbursement.

Tehama County Department of Social Services

The CalWORKs program provides temporary financial assistance and employment-focused services to low-income families with underage children. Tehama County CalWORKs owns two vans that are driven by Social Service Aides to take clients to Welfare-to-Work activities such as Work Experience, Behavioral Health, job readiness classes, and interviews. Additionally, on a case-by-case basis, transport can be provided for the Family Stabilization program or housing programs.

Paskenta Band of Nomlaki Indians - Rolling Hills Clinic

Rolling Hills Clinic in Corning offers non-emergency transportation to Indian Health Service facilities or Indian Health Service referral site appointments for eligible patients. All registered patients of the Rolling Hills Clinic are eligible to apply to use the transportation service. To qualify, patients

must demonstrate they have no other means of transportation and have a medical condition that makes driving difficult. Trips are scheduled on a first-come-first-serve basis in the following order of priority: Paskenta Tribal members, Native American/ Alaska Natives, and patients with chronic medical conditions.

The Greenville Rancheria Tribal Health Program

The Greenville Rancheria Tribal Health Organization provides a variety of transportation services for tribal members and the public, including medical trips to Greenville, Red Bluff, Chico, Reno, Redding, and Davis. Fees vary for non-Native Americans.

The health program has nine vehicles including four-wheel drive SUVs and passenger vans. Program funding comes from Indian Health Services, CalWORKS and general Tribal funds. Service is highly personal with most trips made on a one-on-one basis with drivers staying with patients, including overnight stays on long distance trips.

The California Tribal Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)

The California Tribal TANF Partnership (CTTP) was established in 2003 for the purpose of providing educational training, career, and employment opportunities to Native American tribes. The CTTP provides transportation services to eligible families to services that include GED training, technical skills training, and job search and readiness training. In Tehama, CTTP serves the Greenville Rancheria of Maidu Indians and off-reservation members, families, and descendants of Federally Recognized Tribes.

Home to School Transportation

Fixed route school bus service for K-12 students is provided for the 14 school districts in Tehama County. School buses operated by, or under contract with various school districts, provide the primary source of transportation for students during the academic school year with numerous stops along the major transportation corridor.

2.9.4. *CONNECTIONS TO OTHER TRANSIT SYSTEMS*

Glenn-Tehama Connection

The Glenn-Tehama Connection is a regional route for Red Bluff, Corning, and Orland running Monday through Friday, completing six round trips daily. The route begins at the TRAX Transit Center in Red Bluff and ends at the Newville & 9th Street stop in Orland. Connections can be made to Chico, Willows, and other destinations within Tehama, Glenn and Butte Counties.

Shasta-Tehama Connection Express

The Shasta-Tehama Connection is a Regional Express Route for Red Bluff and Anderson running Monday through Friday, completing five round trips, and Saturday, completing three round trips. The route begins at Red Bluff Airport with stops in Anderson and Cottonwood. Connections can be made to Redding and other destinations within Tehama and Shasta Counties.

Greyhound

There is a curbside Greyhound bus stop located at the Arco Gas Station on Main Street in Red Bluff.

Amtrak

There are no train stations in Tehama County, Amtrak operates a curbside bus stop located at the TRAX Transit Center on Rio Street and Walnut Street in Red Bluff.

2.9.5. *ZERO-EMISSION BUSES*

Innovative Clean Transportation Regulation Overview

CARB's Innovative Clean Transit (ICT) regulation sets a goal for public transit agencies in California to transition from conventional buses to zero-emission buses (ZEBs) by 2040. The regulations require a gradual increase of an agency's percentage of bus procurements to be ZEBs. For Small Transit agencies, 25% of all new bus purchases must be zero-emission by 2026 and 100% by 2029. Agencies can request waivers that allow purchase deferrals in the event of economic hardship or if zero-emission technology cannot meet the service requirements of a given route.

Challenges in Tehama County

TCTAB faces several challenges in converting to an all-ZEB fleet, especially in accordance with CARB ICT regulations purchasing requirements and schedule. Considerable funding will be required to accomplish the ZEB transition, which presents one significant challenge. ZEBs are more expensive to purchase than conventional vehicles and new infrastructure will be required to operate and maintain the vehicles. Continued financial support at the local, state, and federal levels to offset the capital cost of this new infrastructure is imperative.

Beyond cost barriers, TCTAB must also ensure that available zero-emission technologies can meet basic service requirements of the existing service routes and potential travel delays like extreme weather and construction. Currently, TCTAB is planning for a transition based on existing service and ZEB technology. Due to range limitations, current battery–electric technology may present a challenge for the current transit service. Fuel cell electric buses have a higher range, but their capital and operation costs are substantially more.

TCTAB will also need to consider resiliency as ZEBs are deployed. Battery–electric buses rely on electric charging, where a power outage at the depot could mean that providing scheduled service for those who depend on it might become impossible. In addition, in recent years, Tehama County has experienced an increase in power outages year-round due to storms, high winds, heat waves, and wildfires. If these trends continue, as expected, this will only heighten the need for TCTAB to have a strategy to charge buses during power outages.

2.10. ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION

The Tehama County Active Transportation Plan guides the County's investments in bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, policies, and programs to encourage walking and bicycling. The goal of the Active Transportation Plan is to achieve a safe, effective, efficient, balanced and coordinated transportation system that serves the needs of bicyclists and pedestrians within the County and incorporated cities, at a feasible cost. The Active Transportation Plan includes approximately 50 recommended projects, representing a total bicycle and pedestrian need of $37.1 million in Tehama County and consist of bikeway improvements, pedestrian improvements and future studies that include crossings, sidewalks, bikeways, safe routes to schools, and signage projects. Existing pedestrian and bicycle facilities are illustrated in Figure 2.7 through Figure 2.12.

2.10.1. *BIKEWAYS*

In unincorporated Tehama County, bicycle facilities are limited. Paved and gravel shoulders on State Highways serve some bicycle travel and create regional connections for bicyclists. Caltrans District 3 maintains State Highways in the unincorporated County, however TCTC coordinates with Caltrans to ensure State Highway projects meet the needs of County travelers. A limited number of dedicated bicycle facilities are located within the County's incorporated cities and unincorporated communities, including Class II bicycle lanes in the City of Corning along Solano Street, in Los Molinos there are buffered bike lanes on SR-99 and Class II bike lanes on Grant Street and a short segment of Sherwood Blvd, and a limited number of Class II bike lanes and Class I bikeways in City of Red Bluff. City of Tehama does not have any dedicated bicycle facilities.

2.10.2. *PEDESTRIAN ACCESS AND TRAILS*

Pedestrian facilities include sidewalks, crosswalks, ADA-compliant curb ramps, traffic calming measures, and signage. A pedestrian facilities inventory was conducted in 2019 during the development of the County's Active Transportation Plan. The County's pedestrian facilities are sporadic with large gaps in the network in many areas. The City of Red Bluff has a comprehensive network of sidewalks, crosswalks, and curb ramps. In the City of Corning the sidewalk network has many gaps in continuity and requires maintenance and restriping. The City of Tehama has no marked paths or sidewalks for pedestrian traffic.



FIGURE 2.7: CORNING BICYCLE FACILITIES



FIGURE 2.8: LOS MOLINOS BICYCLE FACILITIES



FIGURE 2.9: RED BLUFF BICYCLE FACILITIES



FIGURE 2.10: CORNING PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES



FIGURE 2.11: LOS MOLINOS PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES



FIGURE 2.12: RED BLUFF PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES

2.11. AVIATION

There are two non-commercial, municipal airports located in the county. The Red Bluff Municipal Airport is located in Red Bluff and owned by the city and operated by Cardan Aircraft Services. The Corning Municipal Airport is located in Corning and owned and operated by the City. (Figure 2.11). The closest commercial airport is the Redding Regional Airport, located approximately 25 miles from Red Bluff and 43 miles from Corning. The California Department of Forestry operates two state permitted heliports, one at the Vina Fire Station and one at Lyman Springs. PJ Helicopters has a private facility near the Red Bluff Municipal Airport. The company serves service industries including utilities, construction, water diversion, law enforcement, agriculture, forestry, and helicopter repair.

2.11.1. *RED BLUFF MUNICIPAL AIRPORT*

The Red Bluff Municipal Airport is located two miles south of Red Bluff and is owned by the City of Red Bluff and is also classified as a community airport. The airport has an estimated annual operations count of 26,280 with 119 aircraft and 6 helicopters based at the airport year-round. The operations are comprised of transient aviation, local aviation, air taxi, and military activities.

2.11.2. *CORNING MUNICIPAL AIRPORT*

Owned by the City, The Corning Municipal Airport is located one mile northeast of Corning and is classified as a community airport. The airport has an estimated annual operations count of 8,760 (2018) with 21 aircraft and 6 ultra-light based at the airport year round.

2.11.3. *OTHER AIRPORTS*

Privately maintained airfields serve the recreational and business needs for private pilots. Small airfields exist in or near the communities of Cottonwood, Lake California, Ponderosa Sky Ranch, Rancho Tehama, and Vina.



FIGURE 2.13: TEHAMA COUNTY AIRPORTS

2.12. RAILROADS

The Union Pacific Railroad (UP) and the California Northern Railroad (CFNR) are the two major rail lines operating in Tehama County. The CFNR spurs off from the UP in the City of Davis and runs north along the I-5 corridor, entering Tehama County in the City of Corning and intersecting with the UP in City of Tehama. The UP runs north along SR-99 from the Butte/ Tehama County line through the communities of Vina and Los Molinos, before heading west through the City of Tehama, where it intersects with the CFNR. It then continues north along State Highway 99W through the City of Red Bluff and north along the I-5 corridor, where it crosses Cottonwood Creek into Shasta County.

2.13. GOODS AND FREIGHT MOVEMENT

The movement of goods in and out of the region represents a major component of the overall regional travel demand. Commodities flow in and out of the region by different modes but primarily through trucking and rail.

The majority of freight traffic in Tehama County occurs on I-5 and SR-99, the two main north/south roadways in Tehama County and two of the main north/south roadways in California connecting northern and southern California

Critical corridors in Tehama County include I-5, SR-99, SR-32, and SR-36. I-5 connects Tehama County to Sacramento and Los Angeles to the south and to Redding, Portland and Seattle to the north; SR-99 connects Tehama County to Chico, Yuba City, Sacramento, and Los Angeles to the south; SR-36 connects Tehama County to Susanville and Reno to the east and to U.S. 101 and the California coast to the west.

I-5 and SR-99/36 have been identified as 'High Emphasis Routes' critical to interregional travel by the U.S. Department of Transportation. The Union Pacific Railroad and California Northern Railroad also serve as important means of goods movement through Tehama County.

2.13.1. *TRUCK PARKING*

There are four Caltrans designated Safety Roadside Rest Areas that are currently operational and provide semi-truck parking: the Herbert S. Miles Rest Area has two rest stops (northbound and southbound) along I-5 situated 4.4 miles north of Red Buff, and the John C. Helmick Rest Area has two rest stops (northbound and southbound) along I-5 situated 1 mile north of Corning.

2.14. WATER RESOURCES

Tehama county contains six main watersheds, Battle Creek, Deer Creek, Mill Creek, Tehama East, Tehama West and Cottonwood Creek. The majority of the population lives within the Tehama West watershed. The four main creeks are Reeds, Red Bank, Thomes and Elder Creeks, which are seasonal, so groundwater is the primary water supply for municipal and agricultural uses in the watershed. There are 7 groundwater subbasins that underlie the County: Bowman, Red Bluff, Corning, Los Molinos, Antelope, Bend and South Battle Creek, all of which are monitored for water quality.

2.15. INTERCONNECTIVITY ISSUES

Tehama County's rural and varied topography contribute to connectivity challenges for roadways, transit, aviation, rail, goods movement, and active transportation. The geographic characteristics of this region, such as the Sacramento River Valley, Lassen National Forest, the Sierra Nevada and Cascade Mountain ranges, and many lakes and rivers add complexity to the creation of a robust transportation network throughout the County as well as to the rest of California and the United States.

2.15.1. *ROADWAYS*

Roadways for interregional travel connect Tehama County to surrounding areas including Redding and Shasta County, Chico and Butte County, and Susanville and Reno as well as

major throughfare systems that take residents to the coast and to Oregon or Sacramento. Elevations vary as one travels through Tehama County: SR-36E sits at an elevation of 341 feet in Red Bluff and rises to an elevation of 5,764 feet near Morgan Summit. The weather in Tehama County can change quickly and at any time of the year, causing unpredicted road closures and travel restrictions with short notice. Lane closures due to weather related events, wildfires, or construction and utility work can cause extended travel delays due to the limited travel alternatives. Limited access to major highways and roads from rural areas of the County pose a major threat to evacuating communities from wildfires, floods, or other major weather events.

2.15.2. *TRANSIT*

TRAX provides public transit services in Tehama County. Transit interconnectivity issues exist in Tehama County, both between interregional transit systems and between TRAX and other modes. Due to the inadequate bicycle and pedestrian facilities in most of the County's communities, reaching transit facilities on foot or by bike can be challenging. Transit connections to destinations outside of the County like major medical centers and schools are also limited, presenting challenges to County residents who are unable to drive. TRAX connects to Glenn Ride in Orland, where Tehama County residents can be transported to other destinations in Glenn County, City of Chico, and other Butte County destinations. A recently added transit connection between TRAX and the Redding Area Bus Authority (RABA) in Anderson connects Tehama County residents to Redding and other Shasta County destinations.

2.15.3. *AVIATION*

Red Bluff Municipal Airport - The airport's greatest need is increased commercial hangar space which would generate additional revenue and accommodate the demand for increased operation.

Corning Municipal Airport - Corning operations are comprised of transient and local general aviation and air taxi.

2.15.4. *GOODS MOVEMENTS*

Goods movement in and through Tehama County is subject to disruption from weather related events such as wildfires, landslides, flooding, and winter conditions. Other unforeseen circumstances such as traffic collisions and roadway construction can also create access issues. There are limited alternative truck routes that run through Tehama County. If SR-99 is closed, trucks would have to travel from Red Bluff to Orland (35 miles) via I-5, to take SR-32 into Chico. If any portion of I-5 in Tehama County were closed, trucks would have to utilize SR-36 and SR-99 to obtain access to other major highways. Similarly, if SR-36 were closed, trucks would have to utilize SR-99 or I-5 to obtain access to other highways.

2.15.5. *NON-MOTORIZED TRANSPORTATION*

A primary deficiency of active transportation network in the County is the lack of safe crossing locations on high-volume roadways, particularly State Routes. For example, the wide travel lanes coupled with the five-lane configuration of SR-36 through portions of Red Bluff create challenging and potentially unsafe conditions for pedestrians. Barriers like these, whether they are physical or psychological, often dissuade people from walking instead of driving a vehicle. Inadequate crossings present challenges for people walking, especially the elderly, children, or people with disabilities.

3. POLICY ELEMENT

The purpose of the Policy Element is to provide guidance to regional transportation decision-makers and promote consistency among State, regional, and local agencies. Consistent with the 2024 RTP Guidelines, the Policy Element is intended to:

- Describe the transportation issues in Tehama as a region.
- Identify regional needs for both short-term (0-10 years) and long-term (11-20 years) planning horizons.
- Maintain internal consistency with the Financial Element and fund estimates.

3.1. TRANSPORTATION ISSUES

3.1.1. *FEDERAL ISSUES*

Federal transportation policy and programming provides the direction through which transportation planning decisions are made at the State, regional and local levels.

Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA)

On November 15, 2021, President Biden signed the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA), also known as the bipartisan infrastructure law. The IIJA allocated $550 billion for new initiatives repairing and upgrading U.S. infrastructure, including to repair roads and bridges, improve public transit, and deliver clean drinking water and high-speed internet, among other provisions. It also reauthorized federal spending on long-standing infrastructure programs for funding highway maintenance, electrical grid upgrades, and water reclamation projects, among others, through 2026.

3.1.2. *STATEWIDE ISSUES*

California is dedicated to reducing GHG emissions through sustainable land use and transportation planning. In 2016, the California legislature passed SB 32, codifying a 2030 GHG emissions reduction target of 40% below 1990 levels. The transportation sector accounts for 37% of California's goals of GHG emissions reductions, such as SB 743 (SB 743), described in the following section, which has an impact on the RTP Guidelines and RTP development process. In 2017, transportation funding increased with the passage of California SB 1, a $52 billion transportation program funded by increased State gas taxes and vehicle license fees.

Senate Bill 391 and the California Transportation Plan

Senate Bill 391 (SB 391, 2009) required the California Department of Transportation to prepare the California Transportation Plan (CTP), the State's long-range transportation plan, by December 2015, to reduce GHG emissions and VMT. The Plan states this system must reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels from current levels by 2020, and 80% below the 1990 levels by 2050 as described by AB 32 and Executive Order (EO) S-03-05. CTP 2050 is a roadmap for making equitable, transparent, and transformable transportation decisions in California. The CTP 2050 is a long-range policy plan that provides a collective vision for major metropolitan areas, rural areas, and State agencies to achieve critical statewide goals, policies, and recommendations to guide transportation decisions and investments in the twenty-first century that meet future multimodal mobility needs and reduce GHG emissions.

Senate Bill 1 and the Impact on the Transportation Funding

In 2016, several bills that would drastically change the financial outlook for transportation funding for the next decade were debated within the State Legislature. The results of those legislative efforts culminated in the Governor's signing of SB 1 on April 28, 2017. In November of 2018, California Proposition 8, which proposed a repeal of SB 1, was defeated.

SB 1 is a $52 billion transportation plan funded by increased taxes on gasoline and diesel fuel, and vehicle license fees, including a new fee for vehicles that do not utilize fossil fuels, but do use

public roads. The fund is used exclusively for transportation purposes, including maintenance, repair, and rehabilitation of roads and bridges, new bicycle and pedestrian facilities, public transportation, and planning grants.

SB 1 created the following new and augmented programs that fall under CTC guidelines:

Active Transportation Program (ATP) – $100 million added annually for bicycle and pedestrian projects.

Local Streets and Roads – $1.5 billion added annually for road maintenance and rehabilitation.

State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) – $1.9 billion added annually for projects on State Highways.

State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) – A consistently funded program, the funds historically received by the TCTC will be restored for eligible projects.

Senate Bill 743

In 2013, Governor Brown signed SB 743, which created a process to change the way that transportation impacts are analyzed under CEQA. Specifically, SB 743 requires the Office of Planning and Research to amend the CEQA Guidelines to provide an alternative to level of service (LOS) for evaluating transportation impacts. In 2018 the CEQA Guidelines were amended to include those alternative criteria, and auto delay is no longer be considered a significant impact under CEQA. Transportation impacts related to air quality, noise and safety must still be analyzed under CEQA where appropriate. SB 743 also amended congestion management law to allow cities and counties to opt out of LOS standards within certain infill areas. The updated 2024 RTP Guidelines established vehicle miles traveled (VMT) as the primary metric to document vehicular travel. TCTC has reported existing VMT and projected future VMT on critical regional roadways in the region in this document and will continue to be committed to supporting State and national GHG reduction goals.

California Electric Vehicle Mandate

On September 23, 2020, Governor Newsom signed EO N-79-20, establishing a State goal for 100% of in-state sales of new passenger vehicles and trucks in the State to be zero-emission by 2035. The EO establishes that 100% of medium- to heavy-duty vehicles in the State be zero-emission by 2045 for all operations where feasible, and by 2035 for drayage trucks. Transit fleets are also subject to CARB's Innovative Clean Transit Rule, which requires that 25% of new vehicles in small fleets to be zero-emission by 2026, and all new vehicles must meet that standard by 2029.

3.1.3. *REGIONAL AND LOCAL ISSUES*

Even with new funding guaranteed by SB 1, the Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017, the primary local and regional issues revolve around a shortage of maintenance funding to maintain the integrity of existing facilities. Additional issues at the local and regional level include the need for transportation modes other than the automobile, which can enhance accessibility and connectivity between communities, health services, retail, recreational destinations and employment centers. The following general categories of transportation issues have been identified as:

1. Maintenance and improvement of the existing road systems.
2. Improvement of non-auto transportation modes and programs that lower vehicle emissions due to vehicles, including establishment of an adequate electric grid for use by electric transit vehicles, personal electric vehicles, and electric bicycles.
3. Adherence to climate GHG reduction targets.
4. Promotion of economic development within the region.

Economic development efforts should include RTPAs in their planning decisions to ensure that transportation infrastructure and programs adequately account for any increased demand on the systems. TCTC will maintain roadways to enable recreational tourism and industrial and commercial activity and work with partners to promote recreational activities such as hiking, camping, bicycling, and general tourism. Elements of the transportation system related to industrial and commercial activity include the following:

- Road systems with adequate structural strength to support goods movement on a regular basis.
- Adequate road width to support the travel and tourism industry.

3.1.4. *CLIMATE CHANGE AND GAS EMISSIONS*

In 2006, the California State Legislature adopted AB 32, known as the California Global Warming Solutions Act (Section 38560.5 of the Health and Safety Code). The bill established a cap on statewide GHG emissions and set forth the regulatory framework to achieve corresponding reductions in statewide emissions levels. The updated 2017 RTP Guidelines document provides several recommendations for consideration by rural RTPAs to address GHG. The following strategies from the guidelines have been applied towards small counties:

- Emphasize transportation investments in areas where desired land uses as indicated in a city or County general plan may result in VMT reduction or other lower impact use.
- Recognize rural contributions toward GHG reduction for counties that have policies that support development within their cities and protect agricultural and resource lands.
- Consider transportation projects that increase connectivity or provide means to reduce VMT without imposing negative effects on tourism or access to public lands.

SB 246 – Climate Change Adaptation

SB 246 (Chapter 606, Statutes of 2015) established the Integrated Climate Adaptation and Resiliency Program under the Office of Planning and Research. This program aims to coordinate local and regional efforts to adapt to climate change with statewide strategies.

SB 350 - Clean Energy and Pollution Reduction Act of 2015

SB 350 (Chapter 547, Statutes of 2015), known as the Clean Energy and Pollution Reduction Act of 2015, emphasizes the critical role of widespread transportation electrification in achieving climate goals and federal air quality standards. It underscores the importance of ensuring equitable access to zero-emission and near-zero-emission vehicles, particularly for disadvantaged and low-to-moderate-income communities. This legislation directs agencies to incorporate these goals into regulations, guidelines, plans, and funding programs aimed at reducing GHG emissions.

Pursuant to PUC 740.12(a)(2), it is the policy of the State and the intent of the legislature to encourage transportation electrification to help achieve ambient air quality standards and the State's climate goals. Agencies designing and implementing regulations, guidelines, plans, and funding programs to reduce GHG emissions are directed to take the findings described in paragraph (1) of PUC Section 740.12 into account. RTPAs may incorporate the directives from SB 350 in their planning processes.

Executive EOs on Climate Change Issues

Fighting climate change by cutting GHG emissions is one of California's most important goals. In July 2021, the California State Transportation Agency introduced CAPTI. The 2024 RTP Guidelines require that RTPs be consistent with the CAPTI goals. This plan outlines suggestions for using discretionary transportation funds to address climate change. CAPTI is rooted

in EOs N-19-19 and N-79-20, issued in 2019 and 2020 respectively, which set the framework for these efforts.

EOs regarding climate change establish a crucial framework for RTPAs. Although EOs primarily target State agencies, integrating climate change policies within RTP planning processes supports California's goals of lowering per capita GHG emissions and mitigating the impacts of climate change.

Since the last update in 2017, two EOs have been issued to address climate change. EO N-19-19, issued on September 20, 2019, advocates for using the State's investment portfolio to advance climate leadership and establish a framework for climate investments. CAPTI was formulated in response to this EO.

As noted under Statewide Issues, EO N-79-20, dated September 23, 2020, mandates that all in-state sales of passenger cars and trucks should be zero-emission by 2035. Additionally, it sets a goal for medium and heavy-duty vehicles in California to be zero-emission by 2045.

3.2. REGIONAL GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND STRATEGIES

The goals, objectives, and policies for the 2024 RTP update remain largely unchanged from the 2019 RTP and emphasize the importance of climate mitigation and alternative transportation implementation.

The RTP goals, objectives, and policies were developed to ensure that the Tehama region can uphold a regional transportation system within the financial constraints of State, Federal, and local funding sources.

3.2.1. *STATE HIGHWAYS AND REGIONAL ROADWAYS*

With low traffic volumes and minimal population growth, expanding the traffic capacity of roadways is not a priority. Enhanced safety, operational improvements, and maintenance of the existing system to ensure connectivity are of central importance. According to the Transportation Injury Mapping System (TIMS), 896 total crashes were reported on State Highways between 2012 and 2023. Reducing collision and fatality rates is an important step to address the overall safety of the region. In addition to safety, maintaining regional roadways and connectivity to Shasta, Butte, Glenn, Trinity and Plumas Counties is a critical concern for the region.

GOAL 1. PROVIDE AND MAINTAIN A SAFE AND EFFICIENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM FOR THE MOVEMENT OF PEOPLE AND GOODS WITHIN THE REGION AND CONNECT TO POINTS BEYOND TEHAMA COUNTY.

Objective 1.1 Preserve the existing transportation system with a Pavement Condition Index (PCI) of 68 or better.

Policy 1.1.1 Pursue funding that moves the region toward Goal #1.

Objective 1.2 Increase the efficient movement of goods and people.

Policy 1.2.1 Traffic impacts of proposed land uses shall be evaluated and mitigated, at a project level, in relation to the RTP.

Policy 1.2.2 Optimize the use of existing interregional and regionally significant roadways to improve safety, prolong functionality, and maximize return-on-investment

Objective 1.3 Maintain roadways in a manner that balances cost and facility life cycle.

Policy 1.3.1 Identify and eliminate unsafe conditions on roadway.

Policy 1.3.2 Strategically improve the interregional and regionally significant roadways to keep people and freight moving safely, effectively, and efficiently

Objective 1.4 Maximize funding available for transportation and mobility improvements.

Policy 1.4.1 Representatives from the region should attend meetings and work collaboratively with Rural Counties Task Force, North State Super Region, RCRC CSAC, League of California Cities and CTC to help identify and promote new sources of maintenance funding.

Objective 1.5 Maintain adequate traffic capacity on the core interregional network.

Policy 1.5.1 Access to new development and newly created parcels should meet applicable local standards under applicable plans and ordinances.

3.2.2. *LOCAL ROADWAYS*

Pavement maintenance and safety improvements continue to be the highest priorities for the local road system.

GOAL 2. ALIGN FINANCIAL RESOURCES TO MEET THE HIGHEST PRIORITY TRANSPORTATION NEEDS

Objective 2.1 Identify and prioritize improvements to the roadway system.

Policy 2.1.1 Plan and implement projects to meet objectives.

3.2.3. *CLIMATE CHANGE AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE*

In California, transportation accounts for 37 percent of Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions. Transportation strategies to reduce GHG emissions include reducing, managing, and eliminating non-essential trips, through smart land use, ITS, demand management, and market-based manipulation strategies. It is important that the regional transportation and land use decision-makers pursue projects that adhere to adopted state strategies and regional efforts to meet greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets

GOAL 3. PRACTICE AGRICULTURAL, ENVIRONMENTAL, AND RESOURCE STEWARDSHIP

Objective 3.1 Identify and minimize the direct and indirect adverse impacts of transportation on the environment, including but not limited to: agricultural land, air quality, healthy watersheds, and essential wildlife habitat.

Objective 3.2 Discourage sprawl and land use practices that negatively impact agriculture and the transportation system.

3.2.4. *ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION*

There is a need to enhance bicycle and pedestrian facilities for recreationalists, tourists and residents in the Tehama region. This includes wider shoulders, bicycle lanes, sidewalks, and crosswalks to improve safety and connectivity between community destinations. A lack of active transportation facilities discourages people from walking and bicycling and limits access to local destinations and surrounding communities. People without access to or without the ability to drive a vehicle also need robust transit options. Increasing multimodal mobility options will reduce GHG emissions while benefiting the health and livability of residents.

GOAL 4. CREATE VIBRANT, PEOPLE-CENTERED COMMUNITIES

Objective 4.1 Support local governments in implementing pedestrian and bicycle facilities.

Policy 4.1.1 Pursue funding resources to move region toward Goal #6.

Objective 4.2 Enhance community health, safety, and well-being

Policy 4.2.1 Pursue funding resources to move region toward Goal #6.

Goal 5. Provide an integrated, multimodal range of practical transportation choices

Objective 5.1 Develop an integrated, multimodal range of local transportation choices.

Goal 6. Promote public access and awareness in the planning and decision-making process

Policy 6.1.1 Utilize a broad range of public participation strategies.

4. ACTION ELEMENT

The Action Element presents a plan to address the needs of and issues surrounding each transportation mode, in accordance with the goals, objectives, and policies set forth in the Policy Element. The Action Element also highlights the programs, policies, technical assistance, investments, and other actions to support RTP strategies and goals.

In the Action Element, projects and programs are categorized as short- or long-range improvements, consistent with identified needs and policies. These plans are based on the existing conditions, forecasts for future conditions, and transportation needs discussed in the first three chapters of this RTP.

4.1. PROJECT PURPOSE AND NEED

The purpose of the RTP is to provide a vision for the region, supported by transportation goals, for ten-year (2035) and twenty-year (2045) planning horizons. The ten-year planning blocks allow for consistency with the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), which operates on 5-year cycles. The RTP documents policy direction, actions, and funding strategies designed to maintain and improve the regional transportation system by:

- Assessing the current modes of transportation and the potential of new travel options within the region.
- Identifying projected growth corridors and predicting the future improvements and needs for travel and goods movement.
- Identifying and documenting specific actions necessary to address the region's mobility and accessibility needs and establishing short-term and long-term goals to facilitate these actions.
- Identifying and integrating public policy decisions made by local, regional, State, and Federal officials regarding transportation expenditures and financing.

For Tehama County, each project listed in the RTP project lists contributes to system preservation, operational improvements, safety, and/or multimodal enhancements. These broader categories capture the intended outcome for projects during the life of the RTP and serve to enhance and protect the "livability" of residents in the County.

4.2. REGIONAL PRIORITIES

4.2.1. *MAINTENANCE AND IMPROVEMENT EMPHASIS*

In Tehama, the limited available funding is focused on maintaining existing facilities across all modes. Multimodal improvements for the transit system, aviation facilities, bikeway and pedestrian facilities, and the goods movement system will serve to implement a balanced multimodal transportation network, improve air quality, and help accommodate future travel demand in the region. Should a capacity-increasing project become a regional priority, it would be initiated only when fully or largely funded by revenue sources that otherwise could not be used for maintenance activities. Other capital projects can only be implemented after new funding sources become available to allow full funding of ongoing maintenance responsibilities. The region has limited capacity to fund and implement large projects due to funding and staffing constraints.

4.2.2. *MAINTAIN CONNECTIVITY TO SHASTA, GLENN, TRINITY, PLUMAS, AND BUTTE COUNTIES*

Maintaining the connections to Shasta and Glenn Counties via I-5, Trinity and Plumas County via SR-36, Butte County via SR-32 and SR-99, and Shasta County via SR-89 is necessary to provide access to key destinations outside of Tehama County. These connections are critical for the economy, health, and safety of the residents and visitors to Tehama County.

4.2.3. *REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT PROJECTS*

The Lake California Drive Reconstruction Project will provide a multi-use path for bicyclists, pedestrians and emergency responders. The multi-use path will provide a safe facility for pedestrians and bicyclists to utilize daily, promoting active transportation benefits, providing critical connections to transit and rideshare options, and reducing vehicles on the roadway. During emergency events, the multi-use lane can be utilized by emergency responders, reducing traffic delays, and decreasing emergency response time to hazards.

The Fire Lane Emergency Access Plan for Lake California, Rancho Tehama, and Surrey Village is a comprehensive analysis conducted to identify locations and communities within Tehama County that are at a high risk of experiencing wildfires, flooding, or hazardous materials exposure. Throughout the County, evacuation improvements have been developed by identifying communities with insufficient ingress and egress evacuation routes, addressing local community fire evacuation concerns, and enhancing evacuation operations with improved communication tactics.

4.3. TRANSPORTATION SAFETY

Addressing transportation safety in a regional planning document can enhance the health, economic, and quality-of-life outcomes for residents of and visitors to Tehama County. In response to safety issues, Caltrans crafted a Strategic Highway Safety Plan with one primary safety goal: to reduce roadway fatalities to less than one fatality per one hundred million VMT. The Plan concentrates on 15 “Challenge Areas” concerning transportation safety in California. For each Challenge Area, it provides background data, establishes specific goals, considers strategies to achieve those goals, and discusses institutional issues that could affect goal implementation. The policy aspect of this RTP incorporates safety goals and objectives that are in line with the California Strategic Highway Safety Plan and addresses regional safety needs.

4.4. TEHAMA COUNTY STRATEGIES TO PREPARE FOR CLIMATE CHANGE

The Tehama region faces more hazardous weather and weather-related events in the coming decades as a result of climate change. Potential hazards to the transportation infrastructure include increased severity and frequency of storms, droughts, and wildfires, which may have direct and indirect impacts on the transportation system in Tehama County. TCTC is taking proactive approaches to mitigate any such impacts, one example being the Tehama County Safety, Secondary Access Community Planning & Evacuation Routing Study which provides a comprehensive approach to emergency preparedness and evacuation for Tehama County. An additional resource is the 2023 Tehama County Hazard Mitigation Plan, which details capital projects and pragmatic activities that can mitigate the impacts of hazards.

4.5. TRANSPORTATION SECURITY/ EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

Transportation security and emergency preparedness address issues associated with large-scale evacuation due to a natural disaster or terrorist attack. Achieving the highest levels of emergency preparedness would include maintaining and improving roadways, airport facilities, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and public transit services. Most short- and long-range projects identified for the region have an emphasis on maintenance and operational improvements. In addition to maintaining facilities vital for the region’s safe evacuation, emergency preparedness involves training and education as well as planning appropriate responses to possible emergencies.

4.6. TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT

Transportation systems management (TSM) is a term used to describe low-cost actions that maximize the efficiency

of existing transportation facilities and systems. Urbanized areas can implement strategies using various combinations of techniques. Tehama County looks for the most effective and least capital-intensive solutions. On a project basis, TSM measures are in use to increase traffic flow efficiency and movement through intersections and along highways. Long-range TSM considerations can include:

- Signing and striping modifications
- Parking restrictions
- Paving and re-striping areas to facilitate off-street parking
- Installing or modifying signals to provide alternate circulation routes for residents
- Re-examining speed zones on certain streets

These types of actions will remain part of the RTP and General Plan planning process for the next 20 years.

4.7. INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS (ITS)

Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS), as defined in the Code of Federal Regulations section 940.3, encompasses "electronics, communications, or information processing used singly or in combination to improve the efficiency or safety of a surface transportation system." Its use is a priority for the U.S. Department of Transportation as a key component of the nationwide implementation of the National ITS Architecture, which is a framework devised to encourage functional harmony, interoperability, and integration among local, regional, State, and federal ITS applications. ITS includes technological improvements that enhance the safety and reliability of roadways. Common examples include highway advisory radio and changeable message signs that provide information on detours; delays; road closures, whether temporary or seasonal; weather conditions; and chain requirements. ITS projects complement other transportation strategies. Benefits and cost assessments need to be considered at an early stage in system or project planning to justify the deployment of technologies. As technology has changed, ITS emphasis has shifted from internal operational improvements to coordination with external agencies. Interagency cooperation that enables all agencies to achieve their missions more effectively is the major objective of the Regional ITS Architecture. The proposed ITS technologies have the potential to strengthen efforts that ensure safe, efficient, and functional transportation systems for all modes of travel in the County. Key ITS applications that exist in various locations in Tehama County are included below. In addition, TCTC continues to look for any other new or emerging ITS technologies that could be implemented.

Transit and traveler Information (e.g., telephony and web-based travel information and mobility centers) disseminates public transportation service information to a wider variety of users across a larger network of public transportation service providers.

·Highway advisory information signage allows for coordination between the County, law enforcement agencies, and Caltrans to disseminate current highway conditions to the public.

4.8. PROJECT LISTS

Projects included in the RTP are categorized as either short- or long-range projects. The short-range projects (2025-2035) are shown in Tables 4.1 through Table 4.6. Complete project tables including short- and long-range projects can also be found in **Appendix C.**

4.8.1. *ROADWAY PROJECTS*

Table 4.1 shows current short-range roadway projects for agencies in Tehama County, with funding needs totaling approximately $97 million. The long-range projects can be found in **Appendix C.**

Table 4.1: Roadway Projects

ROADWAY PROJECTS						
RTP Project Number	**Lead Agency**	**Funding Source**	**Description**	**CON year amended for 2025 RTP**	**Project Cost (esc. From previous cost estimate)**	
City of Corning - Short Range						
2019-2029-Maint-Corning	City of Corning	HUTA/SB1/RSTP	Misc. Roadway Maintenance Project (Year 1 thru Year 10)	2025-2035	$	3,000,000
Short Range Total					**$**	**3,000,000**
City of Red Bluff - Short Range						
01-Road-Red Bluff	Red Bluff	HUTA/SB1/RSTP	Kimball Road Rehabilitation (Montgomery Rd. to S. Jackosn St.	2030	$	1,110,000
02-Road-Red Bluff	Red Bluff	HUTA/SB1/RSTP	South Main St Rehabilitation (SR36 to Diamond Ave.)	2030	$	1,672,000
03-Road-Red Bluff	Red Bluff	HUTA/SB1/RSTP	Monroe Street Rehabilitation & ADA Access (Breckenridge St to Corona Ave)	2030	$	1,635,000
04-Road-Red Bluff	Red Bluff	HUTA/SB1/RSTP	Walnut Street Rehabilitation & ADA access	2030	$	1,482,400
05-Road-Red Bluff	Red Bluff	Local/Regional Programs	Johnson St. Rehabilitiation (Hickory St. to Douglas St)	2030	$	643,100
Short Range Total					**$**	**6,542,500**
City of Tehama - Short Range						
01-Road-Tehama	City of Tehama	RSTP	B St From San Benito to 2nd St - roadway and shoulder reconstruction	2025	$	1,120,000
02-Road-Tehama	City of Tehama	SB1/HUTA/Local	H St from 5th St to east of 2nd St to end of right-of-way - roadway & shoulder reconstruction	2025	$	381,000
03-Road-Tehama	City of Tehama	Local/Regional Programs	F St from 5th St to east of 2nd St to end of right-of-way - roadway & shoulder reconstruction	2026	$	352,000
04-Road-Tehama	City of Tehama	HUTA/SB1/RSTP	Traffic calming, 5th St & C St	2026	$	840,000
Short Range Total					**$**	**2,693,000**
County of Tehama - Short Range						
M1-Maint.-County	County of Tehama	HUTA/SB1/RSTP	Roadway Maintenance-Short Range	2025-2035	$	54,876,679
01-Road-County	County of Tehama	STIP (Programmed)	99W Gap Closure, Glenn Co Line-South Ave, rehab	2030	$	9,483,000
02-Road-County	County of Tehama	STIP (Programmed)	99W Gap Closure: Libert to Gyle	2026	$	6,166,650
07-Road-County	County of Tehama	HSIP/HUTA/SB1/RSTP	Lake California Drive Roadway Improvement Project	2028	$	10,355,882
13-Road-County	County of Tehama	HUTA/SB1/RSTP	Reeds Creek Erosion Repair (3 locations)	2030	$	4,251,000
Short Range Total					**$**	**85,133,211**
Short Range Total					**$**	**97,368,711**

4.8.2. *BRIDGE PROJECTS*

The following table shows the short-range bridge projects planned in Tehama County. A total of $45 million in short-range projects have been identified in Tehama County. The long-range bridge projects can be found in **Appendix C.**

Table 4.2: Bridge Replacement or Rehabilitation Projects

BRIDGE PROJECTS					
Project Number (Local)	**Funding Source**	**Description**	**CON Year**	**Cost in CON Year (@13.4%)**	
City of Red Bluff - Short Range					
01-Bridge-RB	HBP	Baker Road Bridge @ Brickyard Creek	2030	$	3,085,264
Total				**$**	**3,085,264**
County of Tehama - Short Range					
03-Bridge-County	HBP	McCoy Low Water Crossing and approaches	2030	$	17,856,976
06-Bridge-County	HBP	Flores Ave @ Oat Creek	2030	$	10,484,160
07-Bridge-County	HBP, Toll Credits	Lowrey Road @ SF Elder Creek	2030	$	3,009,632
08-Bridge-County	HBP, Toll Credits	Tyler Road @ Oat Creek	2030	$	2,608,000
09-Bridge-County	HBP, Toll Credits	Shasta Blvd @ NF Mill Creek	2030	$	5,216,000
10-Bridge-County	HBP, Toll Credits	Mt. Shasta Ave @ NF Hall Creek	2030	$	2,608,000
Short Range Total				**$**	**41,782,768**

4.8.3. *TRANSIT PROJECTS*

The following table shows the short-range operating and capital transit projects planned in Tehama County. A total of $16 million in short-range transit needs have been identified in Tehama County. The long-range transit projects can be found in **Appendix C.**

Table 4.3: Transit Projects

TRANSIT PROJECTS					
Agency	**Project Name**	**Funding**	**CON Year**	**Project Type**	**Total Cost**
TCTC	Transit Operations & Maintenance	LTF, 5311, STA, Farebox	2025-2035	Operations and Maintenance	$ 14,000,000
TCTC	Fleet Replacement	LTF, CMAQ	2025-2035	Fleet Replacement	$ 2,869,900
TCTC	Rio Street Transit Hub Improvements (ZEV infra)	TBD	TBD	Capital Improvements	TBD
TCTC	TRAX Facility Expansion (ZEV infra)	TBD	TBD	Capital Improvements	TBD
Short Range Total					**$ 16,869,900**

4.8.4. *BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PROJECTS*

There are no short-range bicycle and pedestrian projects planned for Tehama County. A total of $43 million in long-range bicycle and pedestrian needs have been identified in Tehama County. The long-range bicycle and pedestrian projects can be found as **Table 4.4: Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects** in **Appendix C.**

4.8.5. *AVIATION PROJECTS*

The following table shows short-range aviation projects in Tehama County. A total of $3.7 million in short-range needs have been identified in Tehama County. The long-range aviation projects were not identified in this RTP update **Appendix C.**

Table 4.5: Aviation Projects

AVIATION PROJECTS					
Project Name	**Funding**	**CON Year**	**Intent**		**Total Cost**
City of Red Bluff - Short Range					
Twy Rehab, Main Apron Rehab and Various-Design	AIP, Local	2019	Aviation Improvements	$	100,000
Helicopter Parking Pads and Apron Expansion - Design	AIP, Local	2020	Aviation Improvements	$	100,000
Twy Rehabilitation - Construction	AIP, Local	2020	Aviation Improvements	$	407,000
East-West Taxiway Rehab and Security Upgrade - Design & CatEx	AIP, Local	2021	Aviation Improvements	$	110,000
Main Apron Pavement Rehabilitation - Construction	AIP, Local	2021	Aviation Improvements	$	342,000
Apron Expansion - Construction	AIP, Local	2022	Aviation Improvements	$	1,340,000
Helicopter Parking Pads - Construction	AIP, Local	2022	Aviation Improvements	$	40,000
East-West Taxiway Rehabilitation - Construction	AIP, Local	2023	Aviation Improvements	$	147,000
Security Upgrades; Fence, Surveillance - Construction	AIP, Local	2023	Aviation Improvements	$	35,000
Airport Layout Plan - Update	AIP, Local	2024	Aviation Improvements	$	175,000
Runway 15-33 Extension - Environmental Documents	AIP, Local	2025	Aviation Improvements	$	100,000
Runway 15-33 Extension - Design	AIP, Local	2026	Aviation Improvements	$	150,000
Runway 15-33 Extension - Construction	AIP, Local	2027	Aviation Improvements	$	650,000
Short Range Total				**$**	**3,696,000**

4.8.6. *CALTRANS STATE HIGHWAY OPERATIONS AND PROTECTIONS PROGRAM (SHOPP)*

SHOPP is a State program administered through Caltrans. A total of nearly $200 million in project needs has been identified for State Highways located in Tehama County.

Table 4.6: Caltrans SHOPP Projects

SHOPP Project List				
Route	**Activity Category**	**Activity Location**	**CON Year**	**Total Project Cost**
5	Advance Mitigation/Mitigation	In Tehama County near Cottonwood on Route 5 at Cottonwood Creek Bridge and on Route 99 at 0.1 mile north of Toomes Creek Bridge. Cottonwood Toomes Excess Lands Transfer (Mitigation Relinquishment)	2024/25	$ 4,200,000
36	Reactive Safety	Horse Gulch Curve Safety Improvement/In Tehama County about 26 miles west of Red Bluff from 5.3 miles east to 5.8 miles east of Dry Creek Bridge.	2025/26	$ 5,590,000
36	Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure	Mineral Multi-Use Path and Shoulders - In Tehama County at and near Mineral 0.1 mile east of Battle Creek Bridge to 0.3 mile east of Route 172	2025/26	$ 4,126,000
5	Roadside	NB and SB Herbert S. Miles SRRA Well Replacement & Wastewater upgrades	2026/27	$ 7,572,000
32	Reactive Safety	Elam Safety Shoulder Widening - Tehama 32 EB lane	2026/27	$ 5,145,000
36	Bridge	Tehama and Plumas Scour Mitigation	2027/28	$ 6,341,000
99	Reactive Safety	Butler-Taft TW-LTL Legal: IN TEHAMA COUNTY NEAR LOS MOLINOS FROM 0.1 MILE SOUTH OF BUTLER STREET TO 0.3 MILE NORTH OF TAFT STREET.	2027/28	$ 3,722,000
5	Roadside	South Main-Diamond Ave Roadside Rehab Legal: IN TEHAMA COUNTY IN RED BLUFF FROM 0.5 MILE SOUTH OF SOUTH MAIN STREET OVERCROSSING TO 0.3 MILE NORTH OF DIAMOND AVENUE OVERCROSSING.	2028/29	$ 15,138,000
5	Proactive Safety	Install cable barrier in the median of Tehama-5 Legal: In Tehama County In and Near Corning from 0.7 mile north of the Glenn County line to McClure Creek Bridge #08-0074	2028/29	$ 27,183,900
36	Pavement	Mineral Pavement Legal: IN TEHAMA COUNTY AT AND NEAR MINERAL FROM 0.8 MILE WEST OF DIAMOND ROAD TO 0.4 MILE EAST OF MILL CREEK BRIDGE.	2029/30	$ 20,968,000
36	Mobility - TMS	Red Bluff Signals Legal: IN TEHAMA COUNTY IN RED BLUFF AT VARIOUS LOCATIONS FROM WALNUT STREET TO COLONY ROAD	2029/30	$ 9,914,600
5	Pavement	Corning Pavement	2031/32	$ 59,634,000
99	Bridge - Health	Bridge work on TEH 99 and 005, to include, but not limited to, replace Deer Creek Overflow bridge (08-0003) and scour improvements on Sacramento River Bridge (08-0096R).	2031/32	$ 11,680,000
36	Pavement	Ponderosa Way Pavement Teh-36-PM 67.5/R75.10	2032/33	$ 14,791,000
32	Drainage	Drainage on Tehama-32 and Trinity-36	2032/33	$ 3,391,000
Total SHOPP				**$ 199,396,500**

4.9. PROGRAM-LEVEL PERFORMANCE MEASURES

In 2015 the Rural County Task Force completed a study on the use of statewide performance measure indicators for the 26 RTPAs in California to evaluate their applicability to rural and small urban areas like Tehama County; the study identified and recommended measures that would best suit the unique conditions and resources available in these locales. These performance measures continue to help in the selection of RTP project priorities and in monitoring how well the transportation system functions.

The following standards guided the selection of performance measures for this RTP:

Performance measures align with California transportation goals and objectives.

1. Performance measures are consistent with the current goals and objectives of Tehama County.
2. Performance measures are applicable to Tehama County as a rural area.
3. Performance measures can be linked to specific decisions on transportation investments.
4. Performance measures do not impose substantial resource requirements on Tehama County.
5. Performance measures can be normalized to provide equitable comparisons to urban regions.

Program-level performance measures are used to help select RTP project priorities and to monitor how well the transportation system functions. The aim of each performance measure and its location within the RTP are described herewith.

4.9.1. *PERFORMANCE MEASURE 1 – CONGESTION/DELAY/VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED*

This performance measure monitors how well State Highways function, based on peak volume, capacity and VMT. The data is reported annually and as a trend beginning in the year 2000. Monitoring this performance measure requires minimal resources as data for the State Highway System is readily available. Not all locations are reported annually in Caltrans vehicle reports; thus, some 'current' data may be more outdated for some roadway sections. This performance measure is reasonably accurate for the State Highway System and may be used in a cost/benefit analysis that includes additional calculations such as travel time delay as a function of time-of-day directional volume/capacity ratio.

The County and incorporated cities do not track VMT. However, Caltrans does incorporate average daily traffic data from the County and is included in the Caltrans vehicle report in a table labeled "Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS) mileage summary by Functional Classification, Population and Net Land Area." Because rural areas contain population centers of less than 5,000 persons or have areas below a population density of 1,000 persons per square mile, VMT is not reported on local roadways.

Desired outcome and RTP/State goals:

- Measure of overall vehicle activity and use of the roadway network
- Input maintenance and system preservation
- Input to safety
- Input health-based pollutant reduction, input GHG reduction
- RTP Goals: 1, 2, 3, 6

4.9.2. *PERFORMANCE MEASURE 2 – PRESERVATION/SERVICE FUEL USE/TRAVEL USE/ TRAVEL DISTANCE/TIME/COST*

This performance measure monitors the condition of the roadway in Tehama County through pavement conditions. Pavement conditions should be monitored every 2 years. This performance measure should have a high level of accuracy which can be indirectly used in estimating the costs of bringing all roadways up to a minimum acceptable condition.

Desired outcome and RTP/ State goals:

- Safety
- System preservation
- Accessibility
- Reliability
- Productivity
- Return on investment
- RTP goals: 1, 2, 3

4.9.3. *PERFORMANCE MEASURE 3 – SAFETY*

This performance measure monitors transportation mode and mode share to understand how State and County roads function based on modes used. The data is reported as a trend over time from 2000 and does not require a high level of additional resource requirements. Although the data is less accurate for smaller counties, the data is reasonably accurate in Tehama County. This performance measure cannot be used as a benefit/cost analysis.

Desired outcome and RTP/State goals:

- Multimodal
- Efficiency
- GHG reduction
- RTP Goals 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

4.9.4. *PERFORMANCE MEASURE 4 – MODE SHARE/ SPLIT*

Addressing transportation safety in a regional planning document can improve health, financial, and quality of life issues for the public. There is a need to establish methods to proactively improve the safety of the transportation network.

This performance measure monitors safety through the total accident cost and should be reviewed annually. To obtain a full picture of this data, staff may be required to access secondary data sources. Reasonably accurate data can be used directly for benefit/cost analysis. The County tracks the number of collisions on local roads and compiles the data to identify locations that need safety improvements. California Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System data from CHP is used to monitor the number of fatal and injury collisions by location to identify needed improvements.

Desired outcome and RTP/State goals:

- Establish baseline values for the number of fatal collisions and injuries per average daily traffic on select roadways over the past three years
- Monitor the number, location, and severity of collisions. Recommend improvements to reduce incidence and severity
- Work with Caltrans to reduce the number of collisions on State Highways in Tehama County
- Completion of projects identified in TCRs and RTP
- RTP Goals: 1, 2, 3

4.9.5. *PERFORMANCE MEASURE 5 – TRANSIT*

This performance measure monitors the cost-effectiveness of transit in Tehama County, and is reported to the Tehama County Transit Agency Board. In accordance with section 99405(c) of the Public Utilities Code and the Transportation Development Act, the Transit Agency Board adopted resolution 11-2002, the alternative performance criteria for the transit system in lieu of the 10% Fare Box Recovery ratio. The criteria adopted was the actual cost per passenger which is an accurate and tangible measurement.

- Desired outcome and RTP/State goals:
- Increase productivity
- Increase efficiency
- Reduce the cost per passenger
- RTP Goals: 3, 6

4.9.6. *PERFORMANCE MEASURE 6 – TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM INVESTMENT*

This performance measure monitors the condition of the roadways in Tehama County, which can be used in deciding transportation system investment. PCI should be monitored tri-annually and this performance measure should have a high level of accuracy. This information can be used indirectly for benefit/cost analysis by estimating the costs of bringing all roadways up to a minimum acceptable condition.

Desired outcome and RTP/State goals:

- Safety
- System preservation
- Accessibility
- Reliability
- Productivity
- Return on investment
- RTP Goals: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5

4.9.7. *PERFORMANCE MEASURE 7 – LAND USE*

This performance measure monitors the efficiency of land use and is reported over time since 2000. There is a need in Tehama County to balance land preservation with land use patterns that discourage sprawl and leap-frog development. Accessing this data requires minimal resource requirements and should be reviewed every 2 years for a high level of accuracy. This kind of data is not used for benefit/cost analysis.

Desired outcome and RTP/State goals:

- ·Land use efficiency
- Coordinate with Caltrans on State Highway projects to maintain them at acceptable levels and reduce lane miles needing rehabilitation
- Recommend RTP projects to maintain roads at or above the minimum acceptable condition as set by the County
- RTP Goals: 6

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

5. FINANCIAL ELEMENT

The financial element identifies current and expected revenue resources available to implement the short-range (2025-2035) and long-range (2036-2045) projects defined in the Action Element of the RTP. The funding in the short-range project list is financially constrained and is either programmed or is reasonably assumed to be available in the year identified. Long-range projections are subject to change and should be updated with each subsequent RTP cycle. Each funding resource identified in the financial element is aligned with eligible projects for that specific resource. The intent of the Financial Element is to define realistic funding constraints and opportunities.

5.1. PROJECTED REVENUES

Table 5.2 presents the expected revenue sources and funding for the next 20 years, categorized by short or long-range timelines. All estimates account for expected inflation based on the consumer price index inflation rate and adjusted to reflect the cost in year of expenditure . Long-range projections are subject to change as funding levels may fluctuate based on sales and excise tax revenue, legislation, and program and policy change.

5.2. COST SUMMARY

Table 5.1 contains a summary of the RTP improvement costs identified for each modal category in the RTP, indicating its financial constraints. Estimates in parentheses represent areas where projected costs are greater than projected revenues. As can be seen, these funding constraints are an issue for many long-range projects.

Table 5.1: Revenue of Costs by Mode

Revenue vs Costs by Mode							
Mode	Funding Source	Projected Revenue		Projected Project Cost		Revenue Minus Costs	
		Short Range	Long Range	Short Range	Long Range*	Short Range	Long Range
Roadway	CMAQ, DIF, HSIP, SRS, STIP, HUTA, SB1	$ 140,297,025	$ 133,771,087	$ 97,368,711	$ 333,932,597	$ 42,928,314	$ (200,161,510)
Bridge	HBP	$ 44,868,032	$ 203,558,880	$ 44,868,032	$ 51,560,000	$ -	$ 151,998,880
Transit	LTF, STA, FTA, Farebox, LCTOP	$ 28,127,982	$ 26,098,234	$ 16,869,900	$ 26,098,234	$ 11,258,082	$ -
Bicycle and Pedestrian	ATP	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 43,240,000	$ -	$ (43,240,000)
Airport Capital	AIP	$ 200,000	$ 200,000	$ 200,000	$ 200,000	$ -	$ -
Total		**$ 73,196,014**	**$ 229,857,114**	**$ 61,937,932**	**$121,098,234**	**$11,258,082**	**$108,758,880**

Table 5.2: Projected Revenues from Federal, State and Local Sources for Tehama County

Projected Revenues from Federal, State, and Local Sources* for Tehama County			
Revenue Category	**Revenue**		
	Short-Range (1-10 yr)	**Long-Range (11-20 yr)**	**Total**
Roadway Funding			
Highway Users Tax Account County (HUTA)[1]	$ 38,988,948	$ 38,988,948	$ 77,977,896
Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account County (SB1)[1]	$ 43,966,983	$ 43,966,983	$ 87,933,966
TCRF Loan Repayment County (SB1)[1]	$ 2,177,280	$ 2,177,280	$ 4,354,560
Total HUTA & SB1 (County)	**$85,133,211**	**$ 85,133,211**	**$170,266,421**
Highway Users Tax Account Corning (HUTA)[1]	$ 2,091,447	$ 2,091,447	$ 4,182,893
Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account Corning (SB1)[1]	$ 1,844,809	$ 1,844,809	$ 3,689,618
TCRF Loan Repayment Corning (SB1)[1]	$ 86,420	$ 86,420	$ 172,840
Total HUTA & SB1 (Corning)	**$ 4,022,676**	**$ 4,022,676**	**$ 8,045,351**
Highway Users Tax Account Red Bluff (HUTA)[1]	$ 3,755,814	$ 3,755,814	$ 7,511,629
Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account Red Bluff (SB1)[1]	$ 3,345,635	$ 3,345,635	$ 6,691,270
TCRF Loan Repayment Red Bluff (SB1)[1]	$ 158,740	$ 158,740	$ 317,480
Total HUTA & SB1 (Red Bluff)	**$ 7,260,189**	**$ 7,260,189**	**$ 14,520,379**
Highway Users Tax Account City of Tehama (HUTA)[1]	$ 168,030	$ 168,030	$ 336,060
Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account City of Tehama (SB1)[1]	$ 99,632	$ 99,632	$ 199,264
TCRF Loan Repayment City of Tehama (SB1)[1]	$ 4,850	$ 4,850	$ 9,700
Total HUTA & SB1 (City of Tehama)	**$ 272,512**	**$ 272,512**	**$ 545,023**
Congestion Management Air Quality (CMAQ)[2]	$ 5,889,696	$ 5,520,000	$ 11,409,696
Development Impact Fee[3]	$ 150,021	$ 150,000	$ 300,021
Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)[4]	$ 2,000,000	$ 2,000,000	$ 4,000,000
Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP)[5]	$ 8,099,720	$ 9,100,000	$ 17,199,720
Secure Rural Schools[6]	$ 10,454,000	$ 5,000,000	$ 15,454,000
State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)[7]	$ 17,015,000	$ 15,312,500	$ 32,327,500
Total Regional Roadway Funding	**$43,608,437**	**$ 37,082,500**	**$ 80,690,937**

Table 5.2 Continued

Revenue Category	Revenue		
	Short-Range (1-10 yr)	Long-Range (11-20 yr)	Total
Transit Funding			
Federal Transit Administration (FTA) 5311[8]	$ 3,738,033	$ 3,716,394	$ 7,454,427
Federal Transit Administration (FTA) 5310[8]	$ 1,602,014	$ 1,592,740	$ 3,194,754
Low Carbon Transit Operations Program (LCTOP)[9]	$ 2,700,775	$ 830,000	$ 3,530,775
Local Transportation Funds (LTF-Article 8)[10]	$ 14,190,560	$ 14,066,500	$ 28,257,060
State Transit Assistance (STA)[11]	$ 5,044,000	$ 5,040,000	$ 10,084,000
Transit Fare Box Revenue[12]	$ 852,600	$ 852,600	$ 1,705,200
Total Transit Funding	**$ 28,127,982**	**$ 26,098,234**	**$ 54,226,216**
Active Transportation Funding			
Active Transportation Program (ATP)[13]	***$ -***	***$ -***	***$ -***
Aviation Funding			
Annual Distribution for Aviation[14]	***$ 200,000***	***$ 200,000***	***$ 400,000***
Bridge Funding			
Highway Bridge Program (HBP)[15]	***$ 44,868,032***	***$ 203,558,880***	***$ 248,426,912***
Total Transportation Revenue	**$ 213,493,039**	**$363,628,201**	**$577,121,240**
State Highway Funding			
State Highway Operation Protection Program (SHOPP)[16]	$ 199,396,500	$ -	$ 199,396,500
Total State Highway Funding	**$ 199,396,500**	**$ -**	**$199,396,500**

(1) Based on average apportionments from State Controller bewteen FY 21/22 through FY 23/24

(2) Based on actual apportionments 2018-2024 and estimated apportionments 2024-2034

(3) DIF based on policy and historic development.

(4) Based on project lists and estimated future projects.

(5) Based on state estimates.

(6) Based on 50% of total estimated apportionments from USDA

(7) Estimate based on$3,062K/year from past 4 STIP FE new capacity estimates. This has been adjusted to reflect the current 2024 STIP adopted 8/5/24 in short range revenue estimate.

(8) Annual 5311 and 5310 funds based on 2023 Tehama Short Range Transit Plan.

(9) State Controller LCTOP Apportionments

(10) Based on 2023 Tehama Short Range Transit Plan

(11) Based on 2023 Tehama Short Range Transit Plan. CDBG must spend 51% before another application can be submitted $35K/year for PTA grants, and then larger grants in two year cycles can be applied for with a cap of $2 million

(12) Based on 2023 Tehama Short Range Transit Plan.

(13) Based on limited ATP funding available and competitive nature of the program.

(14) Based on $10K/airport.

(15) Based on project lists and estimated future projects.

(16) Derived from Caltrans supplied project list.

5.3. REVENUE VS. COST BY MODE

5.1.1. *ROADWAY*

Table 5.3 compares Tehama County roadway improvement costs to the expected available revenues. Roadway revenues identified here include the STIP, Regional Surface Transportation Program, Highway Users Tax Account, receipts from federal lands, and local transportation funds. Each of these programs have different eligibility requirements, but revenues are generally used for roadway preservation, rehabilitation, reconstruction, and other improvements.

Table 5.3: Comparison of Roadway Costs to Expected Revenue

Comparison of Roadway Costs to Expected Revenue						
	Projected Revenue		Projected Costs		Revenue Minus Cost	
	Short Range	Long Range	Short Range	Long Range	Short Range	Long Range
Roadway Comparison	$ 140,297,025	$ 133,771,087	$ 97,368,711	$ 333,932,597	$ 42,928,314	$ (200,161,510)

5.1.2. *BRIDGES*

Table 5.4 compares the expected revenue for bridge projects to expected costs for the next 20 years. The Highway Bridge Program will cover a percentage of the cost of replacing or rehabilitating public highway bridges.

Table 5.4: Comparison of Bridge Costs to Expected Revenue

Comparison of Bridge Costs to Expected Revenue						
	Projected Revenue		Projected Costs		Revenue Minus Cost	
	Short Range	Long Range	Short Range	Long Range	Short Range	Long Range
Bridge Comparison	$ 44,868,032	$ 203,558,880	$ 44,868,032	$ 51,560,000	$ -	$ 151,998,880

5.1.3. *TRANSIT*

Transit projects are funded under the Transit Development Act, which provides moneys from the Local Transportation Fund and State Transit Assistance to supporting public transportation. Additional funding for transit capital purchase and pilot projects is available through the Federal Transit Administration Programs. Local funds and transit fares also cover some costs.

Table 5.5: Comparison of Transit Costs to Expected Revenue

Comparison of Transit Costs to Expected Revenue						
	Projected Revenue by Mode		Projected Costs by Mode		Revenue Minus Cost	
	Short Range	Long Range	Short Range	Long Range	Short Range	Long Range
Transit Operating & Capital Comparison	$ 28,127,982	$ 26,098,234	$ 16,869,900	$ 26,098,234	$ 11,258,082	$ -

5.1.4. *BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN*

Funding for bicycle and pedestrian projects in Tehama County will come primarily from the Active Transportation Program, a highly competitive State grant program.

Table 5.6: Comparison of Bikeway and Pedestrian Costs to Expected Revenue

Comparison of Bikeway and Pedestrian Costs to Expected Revenue						
	Projected Revenue		Projected Costs		Revenue Minus Cost	
	Short Range	Long Range	Short Range	Long Range	Short Range	Long Range
Bikeway and Pedestrian Comparison	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 43,240,000	$ -	$ (43,240,000)

5.1.5. *AVIATION*

The Federal Aviation Administration allocates an aviation grant of $10,000 per year, per eligible airport.

Table 5.7: Comparison of Aviation Costs to Expected Revenue

Comparison of Aviation Costs to Expected Revenue						
	Projected Revenue		Projected Costs		Revenue Minus Cost	
	Short Range	Long Range	Short Range	Long Range	Short Range	Long Range
Aviation Capital & Maintenance Comparison	$ 200,000	$ 200,000	$ 200,000	$ 200,000	$ -	$ -

2025 TEHAMA COUNTY

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

APPENDICES

PRESENTED BY

Green DOT Transportation Solutions

APPENDIX A

OUTREACH

NEIGHBORING COUNTIES LETTERS

October 16, 2024

Butte County Association of Governments
Attn: Andy Newsum, Executive Director
326 Huss Dr. Suite 150
Chico, CA 95928

Re: Tehama County Regional Transportation Plan 2025

Dear Mr. Newsum,

The Tehama County Transportation Commission (TCTC) is in the process of developing an update to the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for the 2025 – 2045 planning horizon. The RTP is the long-range planning document required by law to define the policies, financial projections, and projects within the region. This information is used by TCTC, local agencies, tribes, and the State to implement transportation projects within Tehama County.

Coordination and consultation with adjoining MPOs/RTPAs are recommended by the California Transportation Commission's RTP Guidelines. Our project team is soliciting any potential collaborative projects, and any comments your agency may have for inclusion in the Tehama County 2025 RTP. Input and comments can be submitted at the contact information provided below. Information about the RTP and the CEQA process are available at https://tehamartpa.org/.

If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact me by email at jriskegomez@tehamartpa.org.

Sincerely,

Jessica Riske-Gomez

Deputy Director of Public Works – Transportation
Tehama County Transportation Commission
Tehama County Transit Agency Board
1509 Schwab Street
Red Bluff, CA 96080
(530) 602-8282 x 101
M-TH 6:30AM to 5:00PM

October 16, 2024

Glenn County Local Transportation Commission
Attn: Mardy Thomas
Planning and Community Development Services Director
225 N. Tehama St
Willows, CA 95988

Re: Tehama County Regional Transportation Plan 2025

Dear Mr. Thomas,

The Tehama County Transportation Commission (TCTC) is in the process of developing an update to the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for the 2025 – 2045 planning horizon. The RTP is the long-range planning document required by law to define the policies, financial projections, and projects within the region. This information is used by TCTC, local agencies, tribes, and the State to implement transportation projects within Tehama County.

Coordination and consultation with adjoining MPOs/RTPAs are recommended by the California Transportation Commission's RTP Guidelines. Our project team is soliciting any potential collaborative projects, and any comments your agency may have for inclusion in the Tehama County 2025 RTP. Input and comments can be submitted at the contact information provided below. Information about the RTP and the CEQA process are available at https://tehamartpa.org/.

If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact me by email at jriskegomez@tehamartpa.org.

Sincerely,

Jessica Riske-Gomez

Deputy Director of Public Works – Transportation
Tehama County Transportation Commission
Tehama County Transit Agency Board
1509 Schwab Street
Red Bluff, CA 96080
(530) 602-8282 x 101
M-TH 6:30AM to 5:00PM

October 16, 2024

Mendocino County Council of Governments
Attn: Nephele Barrett, Executive Director
525 South Main St, Suite B
Ukiah, CA 95482

Re: Tehama County Regional Transportation Plan 2025

Dear Ms. Barrett,

The Tehama County Transportation Commission (TCTC) is in the process of developing an update to the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for the 2025 – 2045 planning horizon. The RTP is the long-range planning document required by law to define the policies, financial projections, and projects within the region. This information is used by TCTC, local agencies, tribes, and the State to implement transportation projects within Tehama County.

Coordination and consultation with adjoining MPOs/RTPAs are recommended by the California Transportation Commission's RTP Guidelines. Our project team is soliciting any potential collaborative projects, and any comments your agency may have for inclusion in the Tehama County 2025 RTP. Input and comments can be submitted at the contact information provided below. Information about the RTP and the CEQA process are available at https://tehamartpa.org/.

If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact me by email at jriskegomez@tehamartpa.org.

Sincerely,

Jessica Riske-Gomez

Deputy Director of Public Works – Transportation
Tehama County Transportation Commission
Tehama County Transit Agency Board
1509 Schwab Street
Red Bluff, CA 96080
(530) 602-8282 x 101
M-TH 6:30AM to 5:00PM

October 16, 2024

Plumas County Transportation Commission
Attn: Jim Graham, Executive Director
1834 East Main Street
Quincy, CA 95971

Re: Tehama County Regional Transportation Plan 2025

Dear Mr. Graham,

The Tehama County Transportation Commission (TCTC) is in the process of developing an update to the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for the 2025 – 2045 planning horizon. The RTP is the long-range planning document required by law to define the policies, financial projections, and projects within the region. This information is used by TCTC, local agencies, tribes, and the State to implement transportation projects within Tehama County.

Coordination and consultation with adjoining MPOs/RTPAs are recommended by the California Transportation Commission's RTP Guidelines. Our project team is soliciting any potential collaborative projects, and any comments your agency may have for inclusion in the Tehama County 2025 RTP. Input and comments can be submitted at the contact information provided below. Information about the RTP and the CEQA process are available at https://tehamartpa.org/.

If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact me by email at jriskegomez@tehamartpa.org.

Sincerely,

Jessica Riske-Gomez

Deputy Director of Public Works – Transportation
Tehama County Transportation Commission
Tehama County Transit Agency Board
1509 Schwab Street
Red Bluff, CA 96080
(530) 602-8282 x 101
M-TH 6:30AM to 5:00PM

October 16, 2024

Shasta Regional Transportation Agency
Attn: Sean Tiedgan, Executive Director
1255 East Street, Suite 202
Redding, CA 96001

Re: Tehama County Regional Transportation Plan 2025

Dear Mr. Tiedgan,

The Tehama County Transportation Commission (TCTC) is in the process of developing an update to the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for the 2025 – 2045 planning horizon. The RTP is the long-range planning document required by law to define the policies, financial projections, and projects within the region. This information is used by TCTC, local agencies, tribes, and the State to implement transportation projects within Tehama County.

Coordination and consultation with adjoining MPOs/RTPAs are recommended by the California Transportation Commission's RTP Guidelines. Our project team is soliciting any potential collaborative projects, and any comments your agency may have for inclusion in the Tehama County 2025 RTP. Input and comments can be submitted at the contact information provided below. Information about the RTP and the CEQA process are available at https://tehamartpa.org/.

If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact me by email at jriskegomez@tehamartpa.org.

Sincerely,

Jessica Riske-Gomez

Deputy Director of Public Works – Transportation
Tehama County Transportation Commission
Tehama County Transit Agency Board
1509 Schwab Street
Red Bluff, CA 96080
(530) 602-8282 x 101
M-TH 6:30AM to 5:00PM

October 16, 2024

Trinity County Transportation Commission
Attn: Panos Kokkas, Executive Director
P.O. Box 2490
31301 State Highway 3
Weaverville, CA 96093

Re: Tehama County Regional Transportation Plan 2025

Dear Mr. Kokkas,

The Tehama County Transportation Commission (TCTC) is in the process of developing an update to the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for the 2025 – 2045 planning horizon. The RTP is the long-range planning document required by law to define the policies, financial projections, and projects within the region. This information is used by TCTC, local agencies, tribes, and the State to implement transportation projects within Tehama County.

Coordination and consultation with adjoining MPOs/RTPAs are recommended by the California Transportation Commission's RTP Guidelines. Our project team is soliciting any potential collaborative projects, and any comments your agency may have for inclusion in the Tehama County 2025 RTP. Input and comments can be submitted at the contact information provided below. Information about the RTP and the CEQA process are available at https://tehamartpa.org/.

If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact me by email at jriskegomez@tehamartpa.org.

Sincerely,

Jessica Riske-Gomez

Deputy Director of Public Works – Transportation
Tehama County Transportation Commission
Tehama County Transit Agency Board
1509 Schwab Street
Red Bluff, CA 96080
(530) 602-8282 x 101
M-TH 6:30AM to 5:00PM

AB52 CONSULTATION LETTERS

October 25, 2024

Greenville Rancheria
Attn: Kyle Self
PO Box 279, Greenville, CA 95947
Phone: (530) 528-8600

RE: AB 52 request for consultation – 2025 Tehama County Regional Transportation Plan (Project)

Dear Kyle Self:

This is a formal notice and invitation by the Tehama County Transportation Commission (TCTC) to initiate AB 52 consultation for the proposed Project located in Tehama County. TCTC is working on the development of the 2025 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for the planning horizon 2025-2045. The 2025 Regional Transportation Plan is considered a "project" under CEQA, and this Initial Study is focused on the Plan as a long-term planning effort. Projects identified within the Plan will be individually evaluated under CEQA at the project level when the project is being delivered. The RTP update must be consistent with the 2024 Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines, which requires inclusion of program-level outcome-based performance measures and close ties to the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) and the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP). The overall focus of the 2025 RTP is to develop a coordinated and balanced multimodal regional transportation system that is financially constrained to the revenues anticipated over the life of the plan. The coordination focus brings the County, Caltrans, local communities, governmental resource agencies, commercial interests, and residents into the planning process. The balance is achieved by considering investment and improvements for moving people and goods across all modes including roads, transit, bicycle, pedestrian, trucking, and aviation. Please be advised that an Environmental Initial Study will be prepared for the Project.

In adherence with Sec. 21080.3.1 of the California Public Resources Code (AB 52), please respond within 30 days if you would like to schedule a meeting to initiate formal AB 52 consultation with TCTC.

If you have any further questions regarding the Project, you may contact the Project Manager at jriskegomez@tehamartpa.org or (530) 602-8282.

Sincerely,

Jessica Riske-Gomez
Deputy Director of Public Works – Transportation
Tehama County Transportation Commission

Attachment A – Project Description
Attachment B – Project Location Maps

ATTACHMENT A

COUNTY OF TEHAMA
Regional Transportation Plan Project

PROJECT LOCATION

The project area consists of the entire County of Tehama in the State of California. Tehama County is situated in the northern Sacramento Valley, approximately halfway between the City of Sacramento and the State of Oregon. The County is bound by Shasta County to the north, Trinity and Mendocino counties to the west, Glenn and Butte counties to the south, and Plumas County to the east. The County is approximately 2,950 square miles and 1,887,807 acres. The topography consists of rolling foothills, fertile valleys, flat-topped buttes, and vast rangelands. Tehama County is bisected by the Sacramento River Valley and contains large swaths of land that are part of national forests. The western boundary of Tehama County is situated in the Pacific Coast Mountain Range, and the eastern boundary of the County is in the Cascade Mountains. Elevations range from 341 feet in Red Bluff to 9,235 feet at the peak of Brokeoff Mountain.

BACKGROUND

The Tehama County Transportation Commission (TCTC) is the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for Tehama County. The RTPA is required by California law to adopt and submit an updated Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) and to the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) every five years. The last update to the Tehama County RTP was adopted in 2020. The horizon year for the 2025 Tehama County RTP is 2045, with transportation improvements in the RTP identified as short-term (0-10 years), and long term (11-20 years).

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The 2025 Regional Transportation Plan is considered a “project” under CEQA, and this Initial Study is focused on the Plan as a long-term planning effort. Projects identified within the Plan will be individually evaluated under CEQA at the project level when the project is being delivered. The RTP update must be consistent with the 2024 Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines, which requires inclusion of program-level outcome-based performance measures and close ties to the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) and the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP).

The overall focus of the 2025 RTP is directed at developing a coordinated and balanced multimodal regional transportation system that is financially constrained to the revenues anticipated over the life of the plan. The coordination focus brings the County, Caltrans, local communities, governmental resource agencies, commercial interests, and residents into the planning process. The balance is achieved by considering investment and improvements for moving people and goods across all modes including roads, transit, bicycle, pedestrian, trucking, and aviation.

ATTACHMENT B



Figure 1: Location Map

October 25, 2024

Paskenta Band of Nomlaki Indians
Attn: Andrew Alejandre
22580 Olivewood Avenue
Corning, CA 96021
Phone: (530) 670-1750

RE: AB 52 request for consultation – 2025 Tehama County Regional Transportation Plan (Project)

Dear Andrew Alejandre:

This is a formal notice and invitation by the Tehama County Transportation Commission (TCTC) to initiate AB 52 consultation for the proposed Project located in Tehama County. TCTC is working on the development of the 2025 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for the planning horizon 2025-2045. The 2025 Regional Transportation Plan is considered a "project" under CEQA, and this Initial Study is focused on the Plan as a long-term planning effort. Projects identified within the Plan will be individually evaluated under CEQA at the project level when the project is being delivered. The RTP update must be consistent with the 2024 Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines, which requires inclusion of program-level outcome-based performance measures and close ties to the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) and the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP). The overall focus of the 2025 RTP is to develop a coordinated and balanced multimodal regional transportation system that is financially constrained to the revenues anticipated over the life of the plan. The coordination focus brings the County, Caltrans, local communities, governmental resource agencies, commercial interests, and residents into the planning process. The balance is achieved by considering investment and improvements for moving people and goods across all modes including roads, transit, bicycle, pedestrian, trucking, and aviation. Please be advised that an Environmental Initial Study will be prepared for the Project.

In adherence with Sec. 21080.3.1 of the California Public Resources Code (AB 52), please respond within 30 days if you would like to schedule a meeting to initiate formal AB 52 consultation with TCTC.

If you have any further questions regarding the Project, you may contact the Project Manager at jriskegomez@tehamartpa.org or (530) 602-8282.

Sincerely,

Jessica Riske-Gomez
Deputy Director of Public Works – Transportation
Tehama County Transportation Commission

Attachment A – Project Description
Attachment B – Project Location Maps

ATTACHMENT A

COUNTY OF TEHAMA
Regional Transportation Plan Project

PROJECT LOCATION

The project area consists of the entire County of Tehama in the State of California. Tehama County is situated in the northern Sacramento Valley, approximately halfway between the City of Sacramento and the State of Oregon. The County is bound by Shasta County to the north, Trinity and Mendocino counties to the west, Glenn and Butte counties to the south, and Plumas County to the east. The County is approximately 2,950 square miles and 1,887,807 acres. The topography consists of rolling foothills, fertile valleys, flat-topped buttes, and vast rangelands. Tehama County is bisected by the Sacramento River Valley and contains large swaths of land that are part of national forests. The western boundary of Tehama County is situated in the Pacific Coast Mountain Range, and the eastern boundary of the County is in the Cascade Mountains. Elevations range from 341 feet in Red Bluff to 9,235 feet at the peak of Brokeoff Mountain.

BACKGROUND

The Tehama County Transportation Commission (TCTC) is the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for Tehama County. The RTPA is required by California law to adopt and submit an updated Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) and to the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) every five years. The last update to the Tehama County RTP was adopted in 2020. The horizon year for the 2025 Tehama County RTP is 2045, with transportation improvements in the RTP identified as short-term (0-10 years), and long term (11-20 years)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The 2025 Regional Transportation Plan is considered a “project” under CEQA, and this Initial Study is focused on the Plan as a long-term planning effort. Projects identified within the Plan will be individually evaluated under CEQA at the project level when the project is being delivered. The RTP update must be consistent with the 2024 Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines, which requires inclusion of program-level outcome-based performance measures and close ties to the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) and the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP).

The overall focus of the 2025 RTP is directed at developing a coordinated and balanced multimodal regional transportation system that is financially constrained to the revenues anticipated over the life of the plan. The coordination focus brings the County, Caltrans, local communities, governmental resource agencies, commercial interests, and residents into the planning process. The balance is achieved by considering investment and improvements for moving people and goods across all modes including roads, transit, bicycle, pedestrian, trucking, and aviation

ATTACHMENT B



Figure 1: Location Map

October 25, 2024

Susanville Rancheria
Attn: Wanda Brown
795 Joaquin Street Susanville, CA 96130
Phone: (530) 257-6264

RE: AB 52 request for consultation – 2025 Tehama County Regional Transportation Plan (Project)

Dear Wanda Brown:

This is a formal notice and invitation by the Tehama County Transportation Commission (TCTC) to initiate AB 52 consultation for the proposed Project located in Tehama County. TCTC is working on the development of the 2025 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for the planning horizon 2025-2045. The 2025 Regional Transportation Plan is considered a "project" under CEQA, and this Initial Study is focused on the Plan as a long-term planning effort. Projects identified within the Plan will be individually evaluated under CEQA at the project level when the project is being delivered. The RTP update must be consistent with the 2024 Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines, which requires inclusion of program-level outcome-based performance measures and close ties to the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) and the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP). The overall focus of the 2025 RTP is to develop a coordinated and balanced multimodal regional transportation system that is financially constrained to the revenues anticipated over the life of the plan. The coordination focus brings the County, Caltrans, local communities, governmental resource agencies, commercial interests, and residents into the planning process. The balance is achieved by considering investment and improvements for moving people and goods across all modes including roads, transit, bicycle, pedestrian, trucking, and aviation. Please be advised that an Environmental Initial Study will be prepared for the Project.

In adherence with Sec. 21080.3.1 of the California Public Resources Code (AB 52), please respond within 30 days if you would like to schedule a meeting to initiate formal AB 52 consultation with TCTC.

If you have any further questions regarding the Project, you may contact the Project Manager at jriskegomez@tehamartpa.org or (530) 602-8282.

Sincerely,

Jessica Riske-Gomez
Deputy Director of Public Works – Transportation
Tehama County Transportation Commission
(530) 602-8282 x 101

Attachment A – Project Description
Attachment B – Project Location Maps

ATTACHMENT A

COUNTY OF TEHAMA
Regional Transportation Plan Project

PROJECT LOCATION

The project area consists of the entire County of Tehama in the State of California. Tehama County is situated in the northern Sacramento Valley, approximately halfway between the City of Sacramento and the State of Oregon. The County is bound by Shasta County to the north, Trinity and Mendocino counties to the west, Glenn and Butte counties to the south, and Plumas County to the east. The County is approximately 2,950 square miles and 1,887,807 acres. The topography consists of rolling foothills, fertile valleys, flat-topped buttes, and vast rangelands. Tehama County is bisected by the Sacramento River Valley and contains large swaths of land that are part of national forests. The western boundary of Tehama County is situated in the Pacific Coast Mountain Range, and the eastern boundary of the County is in the Cascade Mountains. Elevations range from 341 feet in Red Bluff to 9,235 feet at the peak of Brokeoff Mountain.

BACKGROUND

The Tehama County Transportation Commission (TCTC) is the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for Tehama County. The RTPA is required by California law to adopt and submit an updated Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) and to the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) every five years. The last update to the Tehama County RTP was adopted in 2020. The horizon year for the 2025 Tehama County RTP is 2045, with transportation improvements in the RTP identified as short-term (0-10 years), and long term (11-20 years).

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The 2025 Regional Transportation Plan is considered a “project” under CEQA, and this Initial Study is focused on the Plan as a long-term planning effort. Projects identified within the Plan will be individually evaluated under CEQA at the project level when the project is being delivered. The RTP update must be consistent with the 2024 Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines, which requires inclusion of program-level outcome-based performance measures and close ties to the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) and the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP).

The overall focus of the 2025 RTP is directed at developing a coordinated and balanced multimodal regional transportation system that is financially constrained to the revenues anticipated over the life of the plan. The coordination focus brings the County, Caltrans, local communities, governmental resource agencies, commercial interests, and residents into the planning process. The balance is achieved by considering investment and improvements for moving people and goods across all modes including roads, transit, bicycle, pedestrian, trucking, and aviation.

ATTACHMENT B



Figure 1: Location Map

TAC MEETING AGENDA (09/05/2024)

TEHAMA COUNTY TEHAMA COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCY TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Board Chambers
727 Oak Street, Red Bluff, CA 96080
(530) 527-4655
http://www.tehama.gov

AGENDA FOR WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 2024

Special Meeting

Chairman: Scott Miller, City of Red Bluff
Vice-Chairman: Kelly Zolotoff, Caltrans District 2

Robin Kampmann, City of Corning; Carolyn Steffan, City of Tehama
Tad Williams, Paskenta Band of Nomlaki Indians, Jim Simon, County of Tehama

This meeting conforms to the Brown Act Open Meeting Requirements, in that actions and deliberations of the Tehama County Regional Transportation Planning Agency Technical Advisory Committee created to conduct the people's business are taken openly; and that the people remain fully informed about the conduct of its business. Any written materials related to an open session item on this agenda that are submitted to the Recording Secretary less than 72 hours prior to this meeting, and that are not exempt from disclosure under the Public Records Act, will promptly be made available for public inspection at Tehama County Transportation Commission, 1509 Schwab St., Red Bluff, CA 96080.

1. Call to Order

2. Public Comment

This time is set aside for citizens to address this Board on any item of interest to the public that is within the subject matter jurisdiction of the TCTAB provided the matter is not on the agenda or pending before this Board. The Chair reserves the right to limit each speaker to three (3) minutes. Disclosure of the speaker's identity is purely voluntary during the public comment period.

4. TAC Announcements

5. Announcements **24-1473**

a) The next Regional Transportation Planning Technical Advisory Committee Meeting is scheduled for November 6, 2024. A Special Meeting will be held before that time to keep on target with the December 2, 2024 adoption target date for the Regional Transportation Plan.

6. 2024 Regional Transportation Plan - GreenDOT Transportation Solutions **24-1499**

GreenDOT Transportation Solutions, will give an informational presentation on the 2024 Regional Transportation Plan Action Element. Following the presentation materials will be distributed to update the start-range and long-range project lists.

Attachments: adopted-2024-rtp-guidelines-for-rtpas-2-a11y

7. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - Associate Transportation Planner Fox **24-1474**

a) Waive the reading and approve the minutes from the November 1, 2023, Regional Transportation Planning Agency Technical Advisory Committee (RTPA TAC) meeting.

Attachments: 110123 RTPA TAC Minutes.pdf

Items for Future Agenda

Closing Comments

Adjourn

The County of Tehama does not discriminate on the basis of disability in admission to, access to, or operation of its buildings, facilities, programs, services, or activities. Questions, complaints, or requests for additional information regarding the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) may be forwarded to the County's ADA Coordinator: Tom Provine, County of Tehama, 727 Oak St., Red Bluff, CA 96080, Phone: (530) 527-4655. Individuals with disabilities who need auxiliary aids and/or services or other accommodations for effective communication in the County's programs and services are invited to make their needs and preferences known to the affected department or the ADA Coordinator. For aids or services needed for effective communication during Tehama County Transit Agency Board meetings, please contact the ADA Coordinator prior to the day of the meeting. This notice is available in accessible alternate formats from the affected department or the ADA Coordinator.

TAC PRESENTATION

TCTC
TEHAMA COUNTY
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Tehama County

2025 Regional Transportation Plan Update

September
2024

Presented by: GREEN DOT transportation solutions

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANS

Identifies future regional transportation needs and plan how these needs can and will be met.

Long-range (20 years)

- Roads
- Bridges
- Transit System
- Bikes and Pedestrians

Long Range Plans Help Communities...

- Maintain character
- Improve infrastructure
- Progress forward

What's Inside

- Policy
- Action
- Financial

ACTION ELEMENT

The Action Element is where new transportation projects take form.

Project Categories

- Roadway
- Bridge
- Transit
- Bicycle and Pedestrian
- Aviation

Set Performance Measures

- Infrastructure Condition
- System Reliability
- Safety
- Environmental Quality

NEXT STEPS

July-August

Develop Policies, Projects and Financial Information

September

Collect and address community input

October

Prepare DRAFT RTP

December

Final Adoption

Questions or Comments?

Contact Jeff Schwein
530-781-2499
jeff@greendottransportation.com

Project Website:
https://tehamartpa.org/planning-documents/regional-transportation-plan/

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

{Notice Published in the Red Bluff Daily News and Corning Observer}

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

Tehama County Transportation Commission
Monday, December 2, 2024, at 8:30 AM
727 Oak Street in Red Bluff, CA 96080.

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Tehama County Transportation Commission will a hold public hearing to consider adoption of the 2025 Tehama County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and associated Negative Declaration. The RTP provides a 20-year vision for local roadway improvements and maintenance, State Highways, bridges, transit, bicycle, pedestrian, and aviation improvements in Tehama County and is supported by transportation goals and projects for the planning horizon. The RTP also includes a funding plan (Financial Element) for implementing identified projects. The Final Draft 2025 Regional Transportation Plan will be available for review and public comment from November 1 through December 1, 2024, at https://tehamartpa.org/planning-documents/regional-transportation-plan/.

The public hearing will be held during the regular meeting of the Tehama County Transportation Commission on Monday, December 2, 2024, at 8:30 AM. The meeting will be held at in the Board of Supervisors Chambers at 727 Oak Street in Red Bluff, CA 96080. The meeting agenda and minutes can also be reviewed by on the county website by following this link: https://tehamartpa.org/meetings/tctc/.

Written comments to be included in the administrative record of the proceedings may be submitted in advance of the public hearing to Brittany White, Project Manager, brittany@greendottransportation.com, 513-635-7063.

Pursuant to California Government Code 65009, if you challenge any of the above actions in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing described in the notice, or in written correspondence delivered to the Tehama County Transportation Commission at, or prior to, the public hearing.

Members of the public are invited to attend the public hearing. Public input is encouraged.

DATED POSTED: November 1, 2024

STAKEHOLDER LIST

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE		
Organization	**Contact Person**	**Title**
Caltrans District 2	Kelly Zolotoff	Vice Chairman
City of Corning	Robin Kampmann	Member
City of Red Bluff	Scott Miller	Chairman
City of Tehama	Carolyn Steffan	Member
Paskenta Band of Nomlaki Indians	Tad Williams	Member
Tehama County Public Works	James N. Simon	Tehama County Public Works Director
STAKEHOLDERS		
Organization	**Contact Person**	**Title**
Bell-Carter Foods, Inc.		
Center for Economic Development	Jason Schwenkler	Director
City of Corning	Brant Mesker	City Manager
City of Corning	Christina Meeds	Planning
City of Corning Public Works	Elijah Stanley	Public Works Director
City of Red Bluff	Robin Kampmann	Public Works Director/City Engineer
City of Red Bluff Planning	Tom Westbrook	Interim City Manager/Community Development Director
City of Tehama	Carolyn Steffan	City Clerk
Corning Chamber of Commerce	Staff	
Crain Walnut Shelling, Inc.	Miranda Iverson	Customer Service Coordinator
Disablilty Action Center	Paul Jones	Administrative Manager
Lake California Community Office	Scott Neilson	General Manager
Lassen County Transportation Commission	John Clerici	Executive Secretary
Los Molinos Chamber of Commerce	Staff	
North Valley Services	Allen Skaggs	
Paratransit Services	Daryl Baker	Maintenace Manager
Paratransit Services	Christie Scheffer	Chief Operating Officer
Paratransit Services	Sharon Young	General Manager
Paratransit Services	Wanda Gray	
Red Bluff Chamber of Commerce	Dave Gowan	CEO
Sacramento River Discovery Center	Bobbie Hughes	
Siskiyou County Economic Development	Tonya Dowse	Executive Director
Tehama County Air Pollution Control District	Joseph Tona	Air Pollution Conrol Officer
Tehama County Farm Bureau	Kari Dodd	Excutive Director
Tehama County Planning	Jessica Martinez	Interim Planning Director
Tehama County Public Works	James Simon	Director
Tehama County Resource Conservation District	Vicky Dawley	District Advisor
Tehama County, Flood Control and Water Concervation District	Justin Jenson	Deputpy Director Public Works-Water Resources
Tehama Economic Development	Red Bluff Chamber of Commerce Staff	
Walmart Distribution Center	Darwyn Jones	General Manager

NEIGHBORING COUNTIES		
Organization	**Contact Person**	**Title**
Butte County Association of Governments	Jon Clark	Executive Secretary
Butte County Public Works	Joshua Pack	Director
Glenn County Transportation Commission	Mardy Thomas	Planning and Community Development Services Director
Medocino Council of Governments	Nephele Barrett	Executive Director
Plumas County Transportation Commission	Jim Graham	Executive Director
Shasta County Planning	Paul Hellman	Director
Shasta County Public Works	Troy Bartolomei	Director
Shasta Regional Transportation Agency	Sean Tiedgen	Executive Director
Trinity County Transportation Commission	Panos Kakkas	Executive Secretary
NEIGHBORING TRIBES		
Organization	**Contact Person**	**Title**
Greenville Racheria	Kyle Self	Tribal Chariman
Greenville Racheria	Patty Allen	Chief Financial Officer/ICWA Designated Agent
Paskenta Band of Nomlaki Indians	Lynn Siedschlag	Director of Engineering and Development
Susanville Indian Rancheria	Wanda Brown	Human Resources
STATE PARTNERS		
Agency	**Name**	**Title**
Amtrak	Sean Kennedy	
California Air Resources Board	Cari Anderson	
California Department of Conservation	Stephen Testa	
California Department of Fish and Wildlife	Region 1	
California Department of Parks and Recreation	Lori Martin	
California Department of Water Resources	Dona Calder	
California Energy Commission	Janea Scott	
California Environmental Protection Agency	CalEPA	
California Natural Resources Agency	Secretary	Secretary
California State Lands Commission	Cy Oggins	
California Trucking Association	Shawn Yandon	
California Water Resources Control Board	Clint Snyder	
Caltrans	John Maxwell	Regional Planner
Caltrans	Kathy Grah	Senior Transportation Planner
Caltrans	Kimi Taguchi	Associate Transportation PlannerSHOPP Coordinator
Greyhound	Juan Castro	Area Manager

FEDERAL PARTNERS		
Agency	**Name**	**Title**
Bureau of Land Management	Derrick Wilson	District Manager
Bureau of Land Management	Jennifer Mata	Agency Administrator/Field
Lassen Volcanic National Park	John Fish	Chief Ranger
National Park Service	Ana Cholo	Public Information
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation	Erica Haga	Emergency Management
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation	Anthony Bertain	Security Program Manager
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	Marha Maciel	Assistant Regional Director of the Pacific Southwest Division
U.S. Forest Service	Joseph Kennedy	

PUBLIC COMMENTS

PUBLIC COMMENTS			
Date Received	**Name**	**Organizatiom**	**Comment Received**
11/13/2024	Elijah Stanley	City of Corning	The City of Corning has reviewed the Tehama County Regional Transportation Plan Draft and have no comments
11/8/2024	Dave McGowan	Red Bluff Chamber of Commerece	It looks like a very comprehensive plan. Any additional monies we could get for County roads in addition to that listed would be huge!

APPENDIX B

COORDINATION WITH STATE WILDLIFE ACTION PLAN

Table 5.4-2 Key Ecological Attributes – Central Valley and Sierra Nevada Province

Key Ecological Attributes	Conservation Units and Targets																
	Great Valley		Sierra Nevada Foothills					Sierra Nevada					Sacramento HUC 1802	Central Lahontan HUC 1605		San Joaquin HUC 1804	Tulare-Buena Vista Lakes HUC 1803
	American Southwest Riparian Forest and Woodland	Freshwater Marsh	Chaparral	California Foothill and Coastal Rock Outcrop Vegetation	California Foothill and Valley Forests and Woodlands	Desert Transition Chaparral	Montane Chaparral	North Coastal Mixed Evergreen and Montane Conifer Forests	Alpine Vegetation	Pacific Northwest Subalpine Forest	Wet Mountain Meadow	Western Upland Grasslands	Clear Lake Native Fish Assemblage	Carson River Native Fish Assemblage	Walker River Native Fish Assemblage	San Joaquin Native Aquatic Species	Upper Kern River Native Fish Assemblage
Area and extent of community	X	X	X	X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Community structure and composition		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Connectivity among communities and ecosystems	X	X	X	X		X	X		X		X	X	X		X	X	
Fire regime			X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X			X
Hydrological regime	X							X								X	
Nutrient concentration and dynamics													X				
Pollutant concentrations and dynamics													X	X			
Soil quality and sediment deposition regime	X				X						X	X	X	X			X
Successional dynamics	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X							
Surface water flow regime	X	X											X	X	X	X	X
Water level fluctuations											X	X				X	
Water quality															X	X	
Water temperatures and chemistry																X	

Table 5.4-3 Focal Species of Conservation Strategies Developed for Conservation Targets – Central Valley and Sierra Nevada Province

Common Name	Scientific Name	Conservation Units and Targets[1]																
		Great Valley		Sierra Nevada Foothills					Sierra Nevada				Sacramento HUC 1802	Central Lahontan HUC 1605		San Joaquin HUC 1804	Tulare-Buena Vista HUC 1803
		American Southwest Riparian Forest and Woodland	Freshwater Marsh	Chaparral	California Foothill and Coastal Rock Outcrop Vegetation	California Foothill and Valley Forests and Woodlands	Desert Transition Chaparral	Montane Chaparral	North Coastal Mixed Evergreen and Montane Conifer Forests	Alpine Vegetation	Pacific Northwest Subalpine Forest	Wet Mountain Meadow	Western Upland Grasslands	Clear Lake Native Fish Assemblage	Carson River Native Fish Assemblage	Walker River Native Fish Assemblage	San Joaquin Native Aquatic Species	Upper Kern River Native Fish Assemblage
Mammals																		
Northern river otter	*Lontra canadensis*	X	X			X												
Pacific marten*	*Martes caurina [=americana]*								X	X	X							
Fisher - West Coast DPS*	*Pekania [=Martes] pennanti*								X		X							
American badger*	*Taxidea taxus*	X		X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X					
Western spotted skunk	*Spilogale gracilis*	X		X	X	X	X	X	X									
Tule elk*	*Cervus elaphus nannodes*	X																
Sierra Nevada bighorn sheep	*Ovis canadensis sierrae*									X	X							

[1] A species is shown for a particular conservation unit only if it is associated with specific conservation targets identified for the unit. For a complete list of SGCN associated with each habitat type by ecoregion, see Appendix C.

* Denotes a species on the SGCN list. Non-asterisked species are not SGCN but are identified as important species by CDFW staff.

Table 5.4-3 Focal Species of Conservation Strategies Developed for Conservation Targets – Central Valley and Sierra Nevada Province

Common Name	Scientific Name	Conservation Units and Targets[1]																
		Great Valley		Sierra Nevada Foothills					Sierra Nevada					Sacramento HUC 1802	Central Lahontan HUC 1605		San Joaquin HUC 1804	Tulare-Buena Vista HUC 1803
		American Southwest Riparian Forest and Woodland	Freshwater Marsh	Chaparral	California Foothill and Coastal Rock Outcrop Vegetation	California Foothill and Valley Forests and Woodlands	Desert Transition Chaparral	Montane Chaparral	North Coastal Mixed Evergreen and Montane Conifer Forests	Alpine Vegetation	Pacific Northwest Subalpine Forest	Wet Mountain Meadow	Western Upland Grasslands	Clear Lake Native Fish Assemblage	Carson River Native Fish Assemblage	Walker River Native Fish Assemblage	San Joaquin Native Aquatic Species	Upper Kern River Native Fish Assemblage
Birds																		
Great egret	*Adea alba*	X	X	X	X		X	X										
Great blue heron	*Ardea herodias*	X	X	X	X		X	X										
Black-crowned night heron	*Nycticorax nycticorax*	X	X															
Least bittern*	*Ixobrychus exilis*	X	X															
American white pelican*	*Pelecanus erythrorhynchos*		X														X	
California condor*	*Gymnogyps californianus*			X	X		X	X			X							
Osprey	*Pandion haliaetus*	X	X			X			X		X						X	
Northern goshawk*	*Accipiter gentilis*	X				X			X	X	X							
Golden eagle*	*Aquila chrysaetos*	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					
Rough-legged hawk	*Buteo lagopus*			X	X		X	X										
Ferruginous hawk	*Buteo regalis*			X	X		X	X										
Swainson's hawk*	*Buteo swainsoni*	X		X	X	X	X	X										
Northern harrier*	*Circus cyaneus*		X	X	X		X	X										
White-tailed kite*	*Elanus leucurus*			X	X	X	X	X										
Bald eagle*	*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*	X				X			X								X	
Snowy plover (interior population)*	*Charadrius nivosus*																X	
Western yellow-billed cuckoo*	*Coccyzus americanus occidentalis*	X																
Short-eared owl*	*Asio flammeus*		X	X	X		X	X				X	X					
Long-eared owl*	*Asio otus*	X		X	X	X	X	X				X	X					
Burrowing owl*	*Athene cunicularia*	X		X	X	X	X	X										
Great gray owl*	*Strix nebulosa*										X							
Spotted owl*	*Strix occidentalis*								X		X							
Vaux's swift*	*Chaetura vauxi*								X			X	X					
Black swift*	*Cypseloides niger*			X	X		X	X	X		X							
American peregrine falcon*	*Falco peregrinus anatum*		X	X	X	X	X	X			X							
Prairie falcon	*Falco mexicanus*			X	X		X	X										
Olive-sided flycatcher*	*Contopus cooperi*								X		X							
Loggerhead shrike*	*Lanius ludovicianus*			X	X		X	X										
Hutton's vireo	*Vireo huttoni*	X				X												
Clark's nutcracker	*Nucifraga columbiana*										X							
Purple martin*	*Progne subis*	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X									
Bank swallow*	*Riparia riparia*	X	X	X	X		X	X				X	X					
Common yellowthroat*	*Geothlypis trichas**	X	X	X	X		X	X										
Marsh wren	*Cistothorus palustris*		X															
Yellow-breasted chat*	*Icteria virens*	X																
Yellow warbler*	*Setophaga petechia*	X		X	X	X	X	X	X									
Rufous-crowned sparrow	*Aimophila ruficeps*			X	X		X	X										
Grasshopper sparrow*	*Ammodramus savannarum*			X	X		X	X										
Song sparrow	*Melospiza melodia*	X	X															

Table 5.4-3 Focal Species of Conservation Strategies Developed for Conservation Targets – Central Valley and Sierra Nevada Province

Common Name	Scientific Name	Conservation Units and Targets[1]																
		Great Valley		Sierra Nevada Foothills					Sierra Nevada					Sacramento HUC 1802	Central Lahontan HUC 1605		San Joaquin HUC 1804	Tulare-Buena Vista HUC 1803
		American Southwest Riparian Forest and Woodland	Freshwater Marsh	Chaparral	California Foothill and Coastal Rock Outcrop Vegetation	California Foothill and Valley Forests and Woodlands	Desert Transition Chaparral	Montane Chaparral	North Coastal Mixed Evergreen and Montane Conifer Forests	Alpine Vegetation	Pacific Northwest Subalpine Forest	Wet Mountain Meadow	Western Upland Grasslands	Clear Lake Native Fish Assemblage	Carson River Native Fish Assemblage	Walker River Native Fish Assemblage	San Joaquin Native Aquatic Species	Upper Kern River Native Fish Assemblage
Birds																		
California towhee	*Melozone crissalis*			X	X		X	X										
Savannah sparrow*	*Passerculus sandwichensis*			X	X	X	X	X										
Tricolored blackbird*	*Agelaius tricolor*	X	X	X	X	X	X	X										
Gray-crowned rosy-finch*	*Leucosticte tephrocotis*									X								
Mammals																		
Vagrant shrew	*Sorex vagrans*											X	X					
Pallid bat*	*Antrozous pallidus*	X		X	X	X	X	X										
Townsend's big-eared bat*	*Corynorhinus townsendii*			X	X		X	X										
Spotted bat	*Euderma maculatum*			X	X		X	X										
Western small-footed bat	*Myotis ciliolabrum*	X		X	X		X	X										
Long-eared bat*	*Myotis evotis*								X									
Fringed myotis*	*Myotis thysanodes*	X		X	X		X	X										
Yuma myotis	*Myotis yumanensis*	X																
Western pipistrelle	*Parastrellus hesperus*			X	X		X	X										
Western mastiff bat	*Eumops perotis californicus*	X	X	X	X		X	X										
American pika*	*Ochotona princeps*									X	X							
Snowshoe hare	*Lepus americanus*								X									
Black-tailed jackrabbit	*Lepus californicus*			X	X		X	X				X	X					
Riparian brush rabbit*	*Sylvilagus bachmani riparius*	X																
Mountain beaver	*Aplodontia rufa*								X		X							
Nelson's antelope squirrel*	*Ammospermophilus nelsoni*	X																
Northern flying squirrel	*Glaucomys sabrinus*								X		X							
California pocket mouse	*Chaetodipus californicus*			X	X		X	X										
North American beaver	*Castor canadensis*		X															
Heermann's kangaroo rat*	*Dipodomys heermanni heermanni*			X	X		X	X										
Giant kangaroo rat*	*Dipodomys ingens*	X																
San Joaquin kangaroo rat*	*Dipodomys nitratoides*			X	X		X	X										
Fresno kangaroo rat*	*Dipodomys nitratoides exilis*			X	X		X	X										
San Joaquin pocket mouse*	*Perognathus inornatus inornatus*	X		X	X	X	X	X										
Dusky-footed woodrat	*Neotoma fuscipes*			X	X		X	X	X			X	X					
Riparian (=San Joaquin Valley) woodrat*	*Neotoma fuscipes riparia*	X																
Large-eared woodrat	*Neotoma macrotis*			X	X		X	X										
Deer mouse	*Peromyscus spp.*	X		X	X		X	X	X									
Porcupine*	*Erethizon dorsatum*					X			X		X							
Gray wolf*	*Canis lupus*								X									
Sierra Nevada red fox*	*Vulpes vulpes necator*									X								
Ringtail*	*Bassariscus astutus*	X		X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X					
California wolverine*	*Gulo gulo*								X	X	X							

Table 5.4-3 Focal Species of Conservation Strategies Developed for Conservation Targets – Central Valley and Sierra Nevada Province

Common Name	Scientific Name	Conservation Units and Targets[1]																
		Great Valley		Sierra Nevada Foothills					Sierra Nevada					Sacramento HUC 1802	Central Lahontan HUC 1605		San Joaquin HUC 1804	Tulare-Buena Vista HUC 1803
		American Southwest Riparian Forest and Woodland	Freshwater Marsh	Chaparral	California Foothill and Coastal Rock Outcrop Vegetation	California Foothill and Valley Forests and Woodlands	Desert Transition Chaparral	Montane Chaparral	North Coastal Mixed Evergreen and Montane Conifer Forests	Alpine Vegetation	Pacific Northwest Subalpine Forest	Wet Mountain Meadow	Western Upland Grasslands	Clear Lake Native Fish Assemblage	Carson River Native Fish Assemblage	Walker River Native Fish Assemblage	San Joaquin Native Aquatic Species	Upper Kern River Native Fish Assemblage
Invertebrates																		
California floater mussel	*Anodonta californiensis*															X	X	
Western pearlshell mussel	*Margaritifera falcata*														X	X	X	X
Valley elderberry longhorn beetle*	*Desmocerus californicus dimorphus*	X																
Fishes																		
Pacific lamprey*	*Entosphenus tridentatus*																X	
Goose Lake lamprey*	*Entosphenus tridentatus* ssp.[2]																	
Pit-Klamath brook lamprey	*Lampetra lethophaga*																	
Green sturgeon*	*Acipenser medirostris*																X	
Lahontan cutthroat trout*	*Oncorhynchus clarkii henshawi*														X	X	X	
Paiute cutthroat trout*	*Oncorhynchus clarkii seleniris*														X		X	
Rainbow trout	*Oncorhynchus mykiss*													X			X	
California golden trout*	*Oncorhynchus mykiss aguabonita*																	X
Kern River rainbow trout*	*Oncorhynchus mykiss gilberti*																	X
Goose Lake redband trout*	*Oncorhynchus mykiss* ssp.[2]																	
Little Kern golden trout*	*Oncorhynchus mykiss whitei*																	X
Mountain whitefish	*Prosopium williamsoni*														X	X		
Hitch	*Lavinia exilicauda chi*																X	
Clear Lake hitch	*Lavinia exilicauda chi*													X				
California roach	*Lavinia symmetricus*													X			X	
Pit roach*	*Lavinia symmetricus mitrulus*																	
Hardhead*	*Mylopharodon conocephalus*																X	X
Sacramento blackfish	*Orthodon microlepidotus*													X			X	
Sacramento pikeminnow	*Ptychocheilus grandis*													X			X	
Lahontan redside	*Richardsonius egregius*														X	X		
Speckled dace	*Rhinichthys osculus*														X	X		
Lahontan Lake tui chub*	*Siphateles bicolor pectinifer*														X			
Lahontan Creek tui chub	*Siphateles bicolor obesa*														X	X		
Goose Lake tui chub*	*Siphateles bicolor thalassina*																	
Sacramento sucker	*Catostomus occidentalis lacusanserinus*													X			X	X
Goose Lake sucker*	*Catostomus occidentalis lacusanserinus*																	
Mountain sucker*	*Catostomus platyrhynchus*														X	X		
Tahoe sucker	*Catostomus tahoensis*														X	X		
Unarmored threespine	*Gasterosteus aculeatus*													X				
stickleback*	*williamsoni*																	
Sacramento perch	*Archoplites interruptus*													X				
Clear Lake tule perch	*Hysterocarpus traski lagunae*													X				
Prickly sculpin	*Cottus asper*													X				

Table 5.4-3 Focal Species of Conservation Strategies Developed for Conservation Targets – Central Valley and Sierra Nevada Province

Common Name	Scientific Name	Conservation Units and Targets[1]																	
		Great Valley		Sierra Nevada Foothills					Sierra Nevada					Sacramento HUC 1802	Central Lahontan HUC 1605		San Joaquin HUC 1804	Tulare-Buena Vista HUC 1803
		American Southwest Riparian Forest and Woodland	Freshwater Marsh	Chaparral	California Foothill and Coastal Rock Outcrop Vegetation	California Foothill and Valley Forests and Woodlands	Desert Transition Chaparral	Montane Chaparral	North Coastal Mixed Evergreen and Montane Conifer Forests	Alpine Vegetation	Pacific Northwest Subalpine Forest	Wet Mountain Meadow	Western Upland Grasslands	Clear Lake Native Fish Assemblage	Carson River Native Fish Assemblage	Walker River Native Fish Assemblage	San Joaquin Native Aquatic Species	Upper Kern River Native Fish Assemblage
Fishes																		
Paiute sculpin*	*Cottus beldingi**														X	X		
Pit sculpin	*Cottus pitensis*																	
Amphibians																		
California tiger salamander*	*Ambystoma californiense*	X		X		X	X	X										
Southern long-toed salamander*	*Ambystoma macrodactylum*								X	X	X	X	X					
Limestone salamander*	*Hydromantes brunus*			X	X		X	X										
Mount Lyell salamander*	*Hydromantes platycephalus*									X	X							
Red-bellied newt	*Taricha torosa*		X															
Western spadefoot*	*Spea hammondii*			X	X		X	X										
Kern Canyon slender salamander	*Batrachoseps simatus*					X												
Tehachapi slender salamander	*Batrachoseps stebbinsi*					X			X									
Relictual slender salamander	*Batrachoseps relictus*								X									
Yosemite toad	*Anaxyrus canorus*														X	X		
Northern leopard frog	*Lithobates pipiens*											X	X					
Foothill yellow-legged frog*	*Rana boylii*	X																
California red-legged frog*	*Rana draytonii*	X	X			X												
Southern mountain yellow-legged frog	*Rana muscosa*								X	X	X	X	X					
Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog	*Rana sierra*														X	X		
Reptiles																		
Northwestern western pond turtle*	*Actinemys marmorata*	X	X			X												
Blunt-nosed leopard lizard*	*Gambelia sila*			X	X		X	X										
Blainville's horned lizard (coast horned lizard) *	*Phrynosoma blainvillii*			X	X		X	X										
Sagebrush lizard	*Sceloporus graciosus*								X		X							
Western skink	*Plestiodon skiltonianus*	X				X												
California legless lizard*	*Anniella pulchra*			X	X		X	X										
Southern rubber boa*	*Charina umbratica*								X									
Ring-necked snake	*Diadophis punctatus*	X		X	X	X	X	X										
California mountain kingsnake	*Lampropeltis zonata*											X	X					
San Joaquin whipsnake	*Masticophis flagellum ruddocki*			X	X		X	X										
Gopher snake	*Pituophis catenifer*	X		X	X		X	X				X	X					
Coast patch-nosed snake*	*Salvadora hexalepis virgultea*			X	X		X	X										
Giant garter snake*	*Thamnophis gigas*	X	X	X	X		X	X										
Birds																		
Greater white-fronted goose	*Anser albifrons*	X	X	X	X		X	X									X	
Sooty grouse	*Dendragapus fuliginosus*								X		X							
California quail	*Callipepla californica*	X		X	X	X	X	X										

Table 5.1-3 Focal Species of Conservation Strategies Developed for Conservation Targets in the North Coast and Klamath Province

Common Name	*Scientific Name*	Conservation Units and Targets[1]															
		Northern California Coast			Northern California Coast Ranges			Northern California Interior Coast Ranges	Klamath								Klamath-Northern California Coastal HUC 1801
		Freshwater Marsh	North Coastal and Montane Riparian Forest and Woodland	Pacific Northwest Conifer Forests	Coastal Dune and Bluff Scrub	North Coastal and Montane Riparian Forest and Woodland	Pacific Northwest Subalpine Forest	California Foothill and Valley Forests and Woodlands	Alpine Vegetation	Fen (Wet Meadow)	Montane Upland Deciduous Scrub	Mountain Riparian Scrub and Wet Meadow	Subalpine Aspen Forests and Pine Woodlands (Meadows)	Subalpine Aspen Forests and Pine Woodlands (Mature Conifer Forest)	Western Upland Grasslands	Wet Mountain Meadow	Native Aquatic Species Assemblages/ Communities
Amphibians																	
Coastal tailed frog*	*Ascaphus truei*		X	X			X			X		X	X		X	X	X
Western spadefoot toad*	*Spea hammondii*				X			X									
Northern red-legged frog*	*Rana aurora*	X								X		X	X		X	X	X
Foothill yellow-legged frog*	*Rana boylii*		X			X											X
Cascades frog*	*Rana cascadae*									X		X	X		X	X	X
California red-legged frog*	*Rana draytonii*	X						X									X
Oregon spotted frog*	*Rana pretiosa*																X
Reptiles																	
Northwestern western pond turtle*	*Actinemys marmorata*	X	X			X		X									X
Western skink	*Plestiodon skiltonianus*							X									
Forest sharp-tailed snake*	*Contia longicauda*		X	X													
Ring-necked snake	*Diadophis punctatus*							X									
Birds																	
Pacific brant*	*Branta bernicla*	X															
Aleutian Canada goose	*Branta canadensis leucopareia*	X															
Sooty grouse	*Dendragapus fuliginosus*			X			X							X			
California quail	*Callipepla californica*							X									
Great egret	*Ardea alba*	X															
Great blue heron	*Ardea herodias*	X															
Snowy plover (coastal population)*	*Charadrius nivosus*				X												
Tufted puffin*	*Fratercula cirrhata*				X												
California condor*	*Gymnogyps californianus*						X										
Osprey	*Pandion haliaetus*			X			X	X									
Northern goshawk*	*Accipiter gentilis*		X	X		X	X	X	X					X			

Table 5.1-3 Focal Species of Conservation Strategies Developed for Conservation Targets in the North Coast and Klamath Province

Common Name	*Scientific Name*	Conservation Units and Targets[2]															
		Northern California Coast			Northern California Coast Ranges			Northern California Interior Coast Ranges	Klamath								Klamath-Northern California Coastal HUC 1801
		Freshwater Marsh	North Coastal and Montane Riparian Forest and Woodland	Pacific Northwest Conifer Forests	Coastal Dune and Bluff Scrub	North Coastal and Montane Riparian Forest and Woodland	Pacific Northwest Subalpine Forest	California Foothill and Valley Forests and Woodlands	Alpine Vegetation	Fen (Wet Meadow)	Montane Upland Deciduous Scrub	Mountain Riparian Scrub and Wet Meadow	Subalpine Aspen Forests and Pine Woodlands (Meadows)	Subalpine Aspen Forests and Pine Woodlands (Mature Conifer Forest)	Western Upland Grasslands	Wet Mountain Meadow	Native Aquatic Species Assemblages/ Communities
Birds																	
Golden eagle*	*Aquila chrysaetos*						X	X	X								
Northern harrier*	*Circus cyaneus*	X															
White-tailed kite*	*Elanus leucurus*				X			X									
Bald eagle*	*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*							X									
Short-eared owl*	*Asio flammeus*	X															
Long-eared owl*	*Asio otus*		X			X		X			X						
Burrowing owl*	*Athene cunicularia*							X			X						
Northern spotted owl*	*Strix occidentalis caurina*		X			X	X							X			
Great gray owl*	*Strix nebulosa*						X										
Barn owl	*Tyto alba*										X						
Vaux's swift*	*Chaetura vauxi*			X						X		X	X	X	X	X	
Black swift*	*Cypseloides niger*									X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Pileated woodpecker	*Dryocopus pileatus*													X			
Clark's nutcracker	*Nucifraga columbiana*						X										
White-headed woodpecker	*Picoides albolarvatus*													X			
American peregrine falcon*	*Falco peregrinus anatum*				X		X	X									
Olive-sided flycatcher*	*Contopus cooperi*			X			X			X		X	X		X	X	
Willow flycatcher*	*Empidonax traillii*	X								X		X	X		X	X	
Hutton's vireo	*Vireo huttoni*							X									
Purple martin*	*Progne subis*	X	X	X		X				X		X	X		X	X	
Bank swallow*	*Riparia riparia*		X			X				X		X	X		X	X	
Marsh wren	*Cistothorus palustris*	X															
Saltmarsh common yellowthroat/San Francisco common yellowthroat*	*Geothlypis trichas sinuosa*	X	X														
Yellow warbler*	*Setophaga petechia*							X			X						
Bryant's savannah sparrow*	*Passerculus sandwichensis alaudinus*				X												

Table 5.1-3 Focal Species of Conservation Strategies Developed for Conservation Targets in the North Coast and Klamath Province

Common Name	*Scientific Name*	Conservation Units and Targets[1]															
		Northern California Coast			Northern California Coast Ranges			Northern California Interior Coast Ranges	Klamath								Klamath-Northern California Coastal HUC 1801
		Freshwater Marsh	North Coastal and Montane Riparian Forest and Woodland	Pacific Northwest Conifer Forests	Coastal Dune and Bluff Scrub	North Coastal and Montane Riparian Forest and Woodland	Pacific Northwest Subalpine Forest	California Foothill and Valley Forests and Woodlands	Alpine Vegetation	Fen (Wet Meadow)	Montane Upland Deciduous Scrub	Mountain Riparian Scrub and Wet Meadow	Subalpine Aspen Forests and Pine Woodlands (Meadows)	Subalpine Aspen Forests and Pine Woodlands (Mature Conifer Forest)	Western Upland Grasslands	Wet Mountain Meadow	Native Aquatic Species Assemblages/ Communities
Mammals																	
Pacific marten*	*Martes caurina (=americana)*		X	X		X	X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X	
Humboldt marten*	*Martes caurina [=americana] humboldtensis*		X			X											
American badger	*Taxidea taxus*							X			X						
Fisher - West Coast DPS*	*Pekania [=Martes] pennant*		X	X		X	X							X			
River otter	*Lontra canadensis*	X						X									
Western spotted skunk	*Spilogale gracilis*			X	X			X									
Mountain lion	*Puma concolor*			X				X									
Tule elk*	*Cervus canadensis nannodes*							X									
Roosevelt Elk	*Cervus canadensis roosevelti*									X		X	X		X	X	
Columbia black-tailed deer	*Odocoileus hemionus columbianus*			X				X		X		X	X	X	X	X	

Table 5.1-3 Focal Species of Conservation Strategies Developed for Conservation Targets in the North Coast and Klamath Province

Common Name	*Scientific Name*	Conservation Units and Targets[1]															
		Northern California Coast			Northern California Coast Ranges			Northern California Interior Coast Ranges	Klamath								Klamath-Northern California Coastal HUC 1801
		Freshwater Marsh	North Coastal and Montane Riparian Forest and Woodland	Pacific Northwest Conifer Forests	Coastal Dune and Bluff Scrub	North Coastal and Montane Riparian Forest and Woodland	Pacific Northwest Subalpine Forest	California Foothill and Valley Forests and Woodlands	Alpine Vegetation	Fen (Wet Meadow)	Montane Upland Deciduous Scrub	Mountain Riparian Scrub and Wet Meadow	Subalpine Aspen Forests and Pine Woodlands (Meadows)	Subalpine Aspen Forests and Pine Woodlands (Mature Conifer Forest)	Western Upland Grasslands	Wet Mountain Meadow	Native Aquatic Species Assemblages/ Communities
Birds																	
Spotted towhee	*Pipilo maculatus*							X									
Tricolored blackbird*	*Agelaius tricolor*							X									
Yellow-headed blackbird*	*Xanthocephalus xanthocephalus*	X															
Mammals																	
Suisun shrew*	*Sorex ornatus sinuosus*		X			X											
Pallid bat*	*Antrozous pallidus*				X			X									
Townsend's big-eared bat*	*Corynorhinus townsendii*		X	X		X		X				X					
Big-brown bat	*Eptesicus fuscus*													X			
Silver haired bat	*Lasionycteris noctivagans*													X			
Hoary bat	*Lasiurus cinereus*													X			
Long-eared myotis (bat)*	*Myotis evotis*		X	X		X				X		X	X		X	X	
Fringed myotis (bat)*	*Myotis thysanodes*		X			X											
Long-legged myotis (bat)*	*Myotis volans*		X			X											
Oregon snowshoe hare*	*Lepus americanus klamathensis*									X		X	X		X	X	
Riparian brush rabbit*	*Sylvilagus bachmani riparius*			X													
Point Arena mountain beaver*	*Aplodontia rufa nigra*		X			X	X										
Northern flying squirrel	*Glaucomys sabrinus*			X			X							X			
San Joaquin pocket mouse*	*Perognathus inornatus inornatus*							X									
North American beaver	*Castor canadensis*	X	X			X											
Sonoma tree vole*	*Arborimus pomo*			X													
White-footed vole	*Arborimus albipes*		X			X											
Dusky-footed woodrat	*Neotoma fuscipes*			X													
Pacific jumping mouse	*Zapus trinotatus*			X						X		X	X		X	X	
Sierra Nevada red fox*	*Vulpes vulpes necator*								X								
Ringtail*	*Bassariscus astutus*			X	X			X									

Table 5.1-3 Focal Species of Conservation Strategies Developed for Conservation Targets in the North Coast and Klamath Province

Common Name	*Scientific Name*	Conservation Units and Targets[2]															
		Northern California Coast			Northern California Coast Ranges			Northern California Interior Coast Ranges	Klamath								Klamath-Northern California Coastal HUC 1801
		Freshwater Marsh	North Coastal and Montane Riparian Forest and Woodland	Pacific Northwest Conifer Forests	Coastal Dune and Bluff Scrub	North Coastal and Montane Riparian Forest and Woodland	Pacific Northwest Subalpine Forest	California Foothill and Valley Forests and Woodlands	Alpine Vegetation	Fen (Wet Meadow)	Montane Upland Deciduous Scrub	Mountain Riparian Scrub and Wet Meadow	Subalpine Aspen Forests and Pine Woodlands (Meadows)	Subalpine Aspen Forests and Pine Woodlands (Mature Conifer Forest)	Western Upland Grasslands	Wet Mountain Meadow	Native Aquatic Species Assemblages/ Communities
Invertebrates																	
California floater mussel	*Anodonta californiensis*																X
Western ridgemussel	*Gonidea angulata*																X
California Linderiella (fairy shrimp)	*Linderiella occidentalis*																X
Vernal pool tadpole shrimp*	*Lepidurus packardi*							X							X		
Conservancy fairy shrimp*	*Branchinecta conservatio*							X							X		
Klamath crayfish*	Pacifastacus *leniusculus klamathensis*																X
California freshwater shrimp*	*Syncaris pacifica*																X
Fishes																	
River lamprey*	*Lampetra ayresi*																X
Western brook lamprey	*Lampetra. richardsoni*																X
Pacific lamprey*	*Lampetra tridentata*																X
Green sturgeon*	*Acipenser medirostris*																X
White sturgeon*	*Acipenser transmontanus*																X
Coastal cutthroat trout*	*Oncorhynchus clarkii clarkia*																X
Steelhead* (and resident rainbow trout) (summer, winter runs)	*Oncorhynchus mykiss*																X
Coho salmon*	*Oncorhynchus kisutch*																X
Chinook salmon* (Spring and fall runs)	*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*																X
Chinook salmon* (Spring and fall runs)	*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*																X

Table 5.1-3 Focal Species of Conservation Strategies Developed for Conservation Targets in the North Coast and Klamath Province

Common Name	*Scientific Name*	Conservation Units and Targets[2]														
		Northern California Coast			Northern California Coast Ranges			Northern California Interior Coast Ranges	Klamath							Klamath-Northern California Coastal HUC 1801
		Freshwater Marsh	North Coastal and Montane Riparian Forest and Woodland	Pacific Northwest Conifer Forests	Coastal Dune and Bluff Scrub	North Coastal and Montane Riparian Forest and Woodland	Pacific Northwest Subalpine Forest	California Foothill and Valley Forests and Woodlands	Alpine Vegetation	Fen (Wet Meadow)	Montane Upland Deciduous Scrub	Mountain Riparian Scrub and Wet Meadow	Subalpine Aspen Forests and Pine Woodlands (Meadows)	Subalpine Aspen Forests and Pine Woodlands (Mature Conifer Forest)	Western Upland Grasslands	Wet Mountain Meadow	Native Aquatic Species Assemblages/ Communities
Fishes																
Longfin smelt*	*Spirinchus thaleichthys*															X
Eulachon*	*Thaleichthys pacificus*															X
Blue chub*	*Gila coerulea*															X
Hitch	*Lavinia exilicada*															X
Navarro roach*	*Lavinia symmetricus navarroensis*															X
Gualala roach*	*Lavinia symmetricus parvipinnis*															X
Klamath largescale sucker*	*Catostomus snyderi*															X
Shortnose sucker*	*Chasmistes brevirostris*															X
Lost River sucker*	*Deltistes luxatus*															X
Tidewater goby*	*Eucyclogobius newberryi*															X
Reticulate sculpin*	*Cottus perplexus*															X
Amphibians																
California tiger salamander*	*Ambystoma californiense*							X								X
Southern torrent salamander*	*Rhyacotriton variegatus*		X	X		X				X		X	X		X	X	X
Red-bellied newt*	*Taricha rivularis*		X	X		X											X
California newt*	*Taricha torosa*	X						X		X	X	X	X		X	X	
Southern long-toed salamander*	*Ambystoma macrodactylum sigillatum*																X
California giant salamander*	*Dicamptodon ensatus*		X	X		X											X
Shasta salamander*	*Hydromantes shastae*											X		X			
Scott Bar salamander*	*Plethodon asupak*											X		X			
Durin's salamander*	*Plethodon dunni*		X	X													
Del Norte salamander*	*Plethodon elongatus*		X	X		X											
Siskiyou Mountains salamander*	*Plethodon stormi*											X		X			

Table 5.1-2 Key Ecological Attributes – North Coast and Klamath Province

Key Ecological Attributes	Conservation Units and Targets															
	Northern California Coast				Northern California Coast Ranges		Northern California Interior Coast Ranges	Klamath								Klamath-Northern California Coastal HUC 1801
	Freshwater Marsh	North Coastal and Montane Riparian Forest and Woodland	Pacific Northwest Conifer Forests	Coastal Dune and Bluff Scrub	North Coastal and Montane Riparian Forest and Woodland	Pacific Northwest Subalpine Forest	California Foothill and Valley Forests and Woodlands	Alpine Vegetation	Fen (Wet Meadows)	Montane Upland Deciduous Scrub	Mountain Riparian Scrub and Wet Meadow	Subalpine Aspen Forests and Pine Woodlands (Meadows)	Subalpine Aspen Forests and Pine Woodlands (Mature Conifer Forest)	Western Upland Grasslands	Wet Mountain Meadow	Native Aquatic Species Assemblages/Communities
Area and extent of community	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
Fire regime				X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Connectivity among communities and ecosystems	X	X		X	X			X		X			X			
Successional dynamics	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Community structure and composition	X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Hydrological regime		X	X		X				X		X	X		X	X	
Soil quality and sediment deposition regime			X	X			X						X			X
Surface water flow regime	X															X
Water temperatures and chemistry																X
Pollutant concentrations and dynamics																X

Table 5.4-4 Key Pressures on Conservation Targets – Central Valley and Sierra Nevada Province

Pressure	Conservation Units and Targets																
	Great Valley		Sierra Nevada Foothills					Sierra Nevada					Sacramento HUC 1802	Central Lahontan HUC 1605		San Joaquin HUC 1804	Tulare-Buena Vista Lakes HUC 1803
	American Southwest Riparian Forest and Woodland	Freshwater Marsh	Chaparral	California Foothill and Coastal Rock Outcrop Vegetation	California Foothill and Valley Forests and Woodlands	Desert Transition Chaparral	Montane Chaparral	North Coastal Mixed Evergreen and Montane Conifer Forests	Alpine Vegetation	Pacific Northwest Subalpine Forest	Wet Mountain Meadow	Western Upland Grasslands	Clear Lake Native Fish Assemblage	Carson River Native Fish Assemblage	Walker River Native Fish Assemblage	San Joaquin Native Aquatic Species	Upper Kern River Native Fish Assemblage
Agricultural and forestry effluents	X	X												X			
Annual and perennial non-timber crops	X	X									X	X	X	X		X	
Climate change	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Commercial and industrial areas	X	X															
Dams and water management/use	X	X									X	X	X	X	X	X	
Fire and fire suppression			X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X			
Household sewage and urban waste water	X	X												X		X	
Housing and urban areas	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	X		X			
Industrial and military effluents																	
Introduced genetic material														X	X		X
Invasive plants/animals	X	X			X				X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Livestock, farming, and ranching	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X	X		X
Logging and wood harvesting	X							X			X	X					
Marine and freshwater aquaculture																X	
Mining and quarrying		X											X	X			
Parasites/pathogens/diseases										X							
Recreational activities					X				X	X	X	X	X			X	
Renewable energy			X	X		X	X	X									
Roads and railroads	X	X			X						X	X		X	X		
Tourism and recreation areas																	
Utility and service lines	X							X									

Table 5.1-4 Key Pressures on Conservation Targets – North Coast and Klamath Province

Pressure	Conservation Units and Targets															
	Northern California Coast				Northern California Coast Ranges		Northern California Interior Coast Ranges	Klamath								Klamath-Northern California Coastal HUC 1801
	Freshwater Marsh	North Coastal and Montane Riparian Forest and Woodland	Pacific Northwest Conifer Forests	Coastal Dune and Bluff Scrub	North Coastal and Montane Riparian Forest and Woodland	Pacific Northwest Subalpine Forest	California Foothill and Valley Forests and Woodlands	Alpine Vegetation	Fen (Wet Meadow)	Montane Upland Deciduous Scrub	Mountain Riparian Scrub and Wet Meadow	Subalpine Aspen Forests and Pine Woodlands (Meadows)	Subalpine Aspen Forests and Pine Woodlands (Mature Conifer Forest)	Western Upland Grasslands	Wet Mountain Meadow	Native Aquatic Species Assemblages/ Communities
Agricultural and forestry effluents	X	X	X		X											X
Airborne pollutants				X												
Annual and perennial non-timber crops	X	X			X											X
Climate change	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Commercial and industrial areas	X			X				X								
Dams and water management/use	X	X			X											X
Fire and fire suppression			X	X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Garbage and solid waste																X
Household sewage and urban wastewater	X	X			X											X
Housing and urban areas	X	X		X	X					X						X
Industrial and military effluents	X															X
Introduced genetic material			X													X
Invasive plants/animals	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X		X	X	X
Livestock, farming, and ranching	X	X	X		X		X	X	X		X	X		X	X	X
Logging and wood harvesting			X						X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Marine and freshwater aquaculture																X
Mining and quarrying	X															X
Parasites/pathogens/diseases			X			X							X			X
Recreational activities				X		X	X	X								
Renewable energy																X
Roads and railroads	X	X	X	X	X											X
Wood and pulp plantations			X													

APPENDIX C

PROJECT LISTS

Table 4.1

ROADWAY PROJECTS

RTP Project Number	Lead Agency	Funding Source	Description	CON year amended for 2025 RTP	Project Cost (esc. From previous cost estimate)
City of Corning - Short Range					
2019-2029-Maint-Corning	City of Corning	HUTA/SB1/RSTP	Misc. Roadway Maintenance Project (Year 1 thru Year 10)	2025-2035	$ 3,000,000
Short Range Total					**$ 3,000,000**
City of Corning - Long Range					
2030-2039-Maint-Corning	City of Corning	HUTA/SB1/RSTP	Misc. Roadway Maintenance Project (Year 11 thru Year 20)	2036-2045	$ 3,000,000
01-Road-Corning	City of Corning	Local/Regional	Blackburn Avenue (widening and reconstruction)	2040	$ 1,100,000
02-Road-Corning	City of Corning	Local/Regional	Solano Street, Houghton and Toomes Avenues (widening and	2040	$ 1,375,000
03-Road-Corning	City of Corning	Local/Regional	South Avenue Interchange Improvements Phase II	2040	$ -
04-Road-Corning	City of Corning	Local/Regional	99W, Solano to South Avenue, Widening & Bridge Reconstruction	2040	$ 8,690,000
05-Road-Corning	City of Corning	Local/Regional	Stripping and Roadway Illumination-Citywide	2040	$ 165,000
06-Road-Corning	City of Corning	Local/Regional	Third Street Widening, N. City Limits to Solano St.	2040	$ 660,000
07-Road-Corning	City of Corning	Local/Regional	Fig Lane Extension and Proposed Jewett Creek Bridge	2040	$ 1,980,000
08-Road-Corning	City of Corning	Local/Regional	Kirkwood Rd. and Fig Lane Intersection Relocation	2040	$ 220,000
09-Road-Corning	City of Corning	Local/Regional	Colusa Street Extension	2040	$ 715,000
10-Road-Corning	City of Corning	Local/Regional	Traffic Signal: Solano Street and Third Street	2040	$ 715,000
11-Road-Corning	City of Corning	Local/Regional	Traffic Signal: Oren Avenue at Solano Street (Hoag Road)	2040	$ 715,000
12-Road-Corning	City of Corning	Local/Regional	Traffic Signal: Marguerite Avenue at Blackburn Avenue	2040	$ 715,000
13-Road-Corning	City of Corning	Local/Regional	Traffic Signal: Third Street at Blackburn Avenue	2040	$ 715,000
14-Road-Corning	City of Corning	Local/Regional	Traffic Signal: Solano Street at Houghton Avenue	2040	$ 715,000
15-Road-Corning	City of Corning	Local/Regional	Traffic Signal: Fig Lane at Marguerite Avenue	2040	$ 715,000
16-Road-Corning	City of Corning	Local/Regional	Traffic Signal: Fig Lane at Hwy 99W	2040	$ 715,000
17-Road-Corning	City of Corning	Local/Regional	Solano Interchange East Side Improvements: relocate sign,	2040	$ 715,000
Long Range Total					**$ 23,625,000**
City of Red Bluff - Short Range					
01-Road-Red Bluff	Red Bluff	HUTA/SB1/RSTP	Kimball Road Rehabilitation (Montgomery Rd. to S. Jackosn St.	2030	$ 1,110,000
02-Road-Red Bluff	Red Bluff	HUTA/SB1/RSTP	South Main St Rehabilitation (SR36 to Diamond Ave.)	2030	$ 1,672,000
03-Road-Red Bluff	Red Bluff	HUTA/SB1/RSTP	Monroe Street Rehabilitation & ADA Access (Breckenridge St to	2030	$ 1,635,000
04-Road-Red Bluff	Red Bluff	HUTA/SB1/RSTP	Walnut Street Rehabilitation & ADA access	2030	$ 1,482,400
05-Road-Red Bluff	Red Bluff	Local/Regional	Johnson St. Rehabilitiation (Hickory St. to Douglas St)	2030	$ 643,100
Short Range Total					**$ 6,542,500**
City of Red Bluff - Long Range					
06-Road-Red Bluff	Red Bluff	Local/Regional	Railroad Crossing @ South Main/UP Overcrossing replacement	2040	$ 4,400,000

RTP Project Number	Lead Agency	Funding Source	Description	CON year amended for 2025 RTP	Project Cost (esc. From previous cost estimate)
07-Road-Red Bluff	Red Bluff	Local/Regional	Traffic Signal: South Jackson @ Aloha	2040	$ 550,000
08-Road-Red Bluff	Red Bluff	Local/Regional	Traffic Signal: Jackson @ Oak	2040	$ 550,000
09-Road-Red Bluff	Red Bluff	Local/Regional	Luther Road Rehabilitation (South Jackson Street to Airport)	2040	$ 638,000
12-Road-Red Bluff	Red Bluff	Local/Regional	Walnut St. @ Paskenta Road Intersection Improvements	2040	$ 1,826,000
13-Road-Red Bluff	Red Bluff	Local/Regional	Vista Way Extension to Montgomery St.	2040	$ 2,200,000
14-Road-Red Bluff	Red Bluff	Local/Regional	Luther Road @ S. Main Intersection Reconstruction, Rehabilitation	2040	$ 3,803,800
10-Road-Red Bluff	Red Bluff	Local/Regional	Baker Road and Walnut Street Intersection Improvements	2040	$ -
11-Road-Red Bluff	Red Bluff	Local/Regional	South Main Street Interchange Reconfiguration (**Caltrans**)	2040	$ -
Long Range Total					**$ 13,967,800**
City of Tehama - Short Range					
01-Road-Tehama	City of Tehama	RSTP	B St From San Benito to 2nd St - roadway and shoulder reconstruction	2025	$ 1,120,000
02-Road-Tehama	City of Tehama	SB1/HUTA/Local	H St from 5th St to east of 2nd St to end of right-of-way - roadway & shoulder reconstruction	2025	$ 381,000
03-Road-Tehama	City of Tehama	Local/Regional Programs	F St from 5th St to east of 2nd St to end of right-of-way - roadway & shoulder reconstruction	2026	$ 352,000
04-Road-Tehama	City of Tehama	HUTA/SB1/RSTP	Traffic calming, 5th St & C St	2026	$ 840,000
Short Range Total					**$ 2,693,000**
City of Tehama - Long Range					
05-Road-Tehama	City of Tehama	Local/Regional	Tehama Avenue from east end of bridge to westerly city limits (+/- 2,000 LF)	2027	$ 430,000
06-Road-Tehama	City of Tehama	Local/Regional	G St from west of 5th St (end of city right-of-way) to east of 2nd St (+/- 1,600 LF)	2028	$ 340,000
07-Road-Tehama	City of Tehama	Local/Regional	E St from west of 5th St (end of city right-of-way) to east of 2nd St (end of city right-of-way) (+/-1,600 LF)	2028	$ 340,000
08-Road-Tehama	City of Tehama	Local/Regional	2nd St from north of C St (end of city right-of-way) to I St (+/-2,700 LF)	2029	$ 570,000
09-Road-Tehama	City of Tehama	Local/Regional	I St west of 5th St (end of city right-of-way) to east of 2nd St (end of city right-of-way) (+/-1,600 LF)	2029	$ 340,000
10-Road-Tehama	City of Tehama	Local/Regional	Cavalier Dr from north of C St (end of city right-of-way) to C St (+/- 160 LF)	2030	$ 35,000
11-Road-Tehama	City of Tehama	Local/Regional	4th St from north of C St (end of city right-of-way) to I St (+/-2,700 LF)	2030	$ 570,000
12-Road-Tehama	City of Tehama	Local/Regional	C St & Tehama Ave from east end of bridge to east end of C st (city limits) (+/-1,900 LF)	2032	$ 410,000
13-Road-Tehama	City of Tehama	Local/Regional	5 St from north of North B St (end of city limits) to E St (+/-1,600 LF)	2032	$ 340,000
14-Road-Tehama	City of Tehama	Local/Regional	Cavalier Dr from C St to D St (+/-1,200 LF)	2032	$ 260,000

RTP Project Number	Lead Agency	Funding Source	Description	CON year amended for 2025 RTP	Project Cost (esc. From previous cost estimate)
15-Road-Tehama	City of Tehama	Local/Regional	2nd St from I St to East Gyle Road (+/-1,400 LF)	2035	$ 300,000
16-Road-Tehama	City of Tehama	Local/Regional	East Gyle Road from 5th Street to east of 2nd St (end of city right-of-way) (+/-1,700 LF)	2035	$ 360,000
17-Road-Tehama	City of Tehama	Local/Regional	3rd St from north of C St (end of city right-of-way) to I St (+/-2,700 LF)	2035+	$ 570,000
18-Road-Tehama	City of Tehama	Local/Regional	D St from West of 5th (end of city right-of-way) to east of 2nd St (end of city right-of-way) (+/-1,600 LF)	2035+	$ 340,000
19-Road-Tehama	City of Tehama	Local/Regional	5th St from E St to Hail Road (end of city right-of-way) (+/-4,500 LF)	2035+	$ 950,000
Long Range Total					**$ 6,155,000**
County of Tehama - Short Range					
M1-Maint.-County	County of Tehama	HUTA/SB1/RSTP	Roadway Maintenance-Short Range	2025-2035	$ 54,876,679
01-Road-County	County of Tehama	STIP (Programmed)	99W Gap Closure, Glenn Co Line-South Ave, rehab	2030	$ 9,483,000
02-Road-County	County of Tehama	STIP (Programmed)	99W Gap Closure: Libert to Gyle	2026	$ 6,166,650
07-Road-County	County of Tehama	HSIP/HUTA/SB1/RSTP	Lake California Drive Roadway Improvement Project	2028	$ 10,355,882
13-Road-County	County of Tehama	HUTA/SB1/RSTP	Reeds Creek Erosion Repair (3 locations)	2030	$ 4,251,000
Short Range Total					**$ 85,133,211**
County of Tehama - Long Range					
08-Road-County	County of Tehama	HUTA/SB1/RSTP	Gyle Road & 99W Roundabout	2040	$ 1,800,000
04-Road-County	County of Tehama	Long Range HSIP	South Avenue, Million Road to Hall Road Intersection	2040	$ 1,200,000
05-Road-County	County of Tehama	Long Range HSIP	Hall Road, South Avenue to Gardiner Ferry	2040	$ 1,200,000
06-Road-County	County of Tehama	Long Range HSIP	Bowman Road, Wildridge to Interstate 5	2040	$ 2,400,000
12A-Road-County	County of Tehama	HUTA/SB1/RSTP	South Avenue Reconstruction-Phase 1	2040	$ 6,000,000
12B-Road-County	County of Tehama	Local/Regional	South Avenue Reconstruction-Phase 2	2040	$ 14,400,000
13-Road-County	County of Tehama	Local/Regional	Baker Road Recon. Widening, Turn Lane	2040	$ 6,000,000
34-Road-County	County of Tehama	Local/Regional	Bend Ferry Road Reconstruction	2040	$ 1,800,000
M2-Maint.-County	County of Tehama	HUTA/RSTP	Roadway Maintenance-Long Range	2040	$ 91,320,000
14-Road-County	County of Tehama	HSIP/Local	South Avenue & Hall Road-Roundabout	2040	$ 3,600,000
17-Road-County	County of Tehama	HSIP/Local	South Avenue & Kirkwood Road	2040	$ 1,800,000
19-Road-County	County of Tehama	HSIP/Local	Hooker Creek & Bowman Road	2040	$ 1,800,000
20A-Road-County	County of Tehama	HUTA/SB1/RSTP	Bowman Road Reconstruction Phase I	2040	$ 6,740,797
20B-Road-County	County of Tehama	Local/Regional	Bowman Road Reconstruction Phase II	2040	$ 7,059,600
24-Road-County	County of Tehama	HSIP/Local	99W & Tyler Road	2040	$ 1,800,000
25-Road-County	County of Tehama	HSIP/Local	Barham Road & Liberal Avenue Intersection Improvements	2040	$ 3,000,000
26-Road-County	County of Tehama	HSIP/Local	Plymire Road & Baker Road Intersection Improvements	2040	$ 1,800,000
27-Road-County	County of Tehama	HSIP/Local	Walnut Street & Wilder Road Intersection Improvements	2040	$ 1,800,000
28-Road-County	County of Tehama	HSIP/Local	South Avenue & Rowles Road Intersection Improvements	2040	$ 1,800,000
29-Road-County	County of Tehama	HSIP/Local	Corning Road & Rawson Road Intersection Improvements	2040	$ 1,800,000

RTP Project Number	Lead Agency	Funding Source	Description	CON year amended for 2025 RTP	Project Cost (esc. From previous cost estimate)
30-Road-County	County of Tehama	HSIP/Local	99W & Liberal Avenue Intersection Improvements	2040	$ 1,800,000
15-Road-County	County of Tehama	HSIP/Local	Lake California secondary access road	2040	$ -
21-Road-County	County of Tehama	Local/Regional	Rancho Tehama Road Reconstruction	2040	$ 12,000,000
23-Road-County	County of Tehama	Local/Regional	Kirkwood Road Reconstruction, widening, and geometric change to	2040	$ 1,034,400
35-Road-County	County of Tehama	FLAP	Jellys Ferry Reconstruction North	2040	$ 7,200,000
31-Road-County	County of Tehama	Local/Regional	Evergreen Road Reconstruction	2040	$ 9,000,000
32-Road-County	County of Tehama	Local/Regional	Gyle Road Rehabilitation	2040	$ 12,000,000
36-Road-County	County of Tehama	Local/Regional Programs	Jellys Ferry South-Widen Shoulder and Overlay (I5 to Bend Ferry Road)	2040	$ 9,600,000
37-Road-County	County of Tehama	Local/Regional	Hooker Creek and Bowman Road Interchange Replacements	2040	$ 72,000,000
38-Road-County	County of Tehama	Local/Regional	Sunset Hills Drive Interchange Reconstruction	2040	$ 3,600,000
39-Road-County	County of Tehama	Local/Regional	Countywide Emergency Siren System	TBD	$ 2,000,000
40-Road-County	County of Tehama	Local/Regional	Countywide Emergency Evacuation Wayfinding and Routing	TBD	$ 250,000
41-Road-County	County of Tehama	Local/Regional	Genasys Countywide Notification System	TBD	TBD
42-Road-County	County of Tehama	Local/Regional	Lake California Secondary Emergency Access – Fire Lane Access	TBD	TBD
43-Road-County	County of Tehama	Local/Regional	Manton and Mineral Area Projects	TBD	TBD
44-Road-County	County of Tehama	Local/Regional	Evergreen Road Widening Project	TBD	$ 500,000
45-Road-County	County of Tehama	Local/Regional	Luce Griswold Road Paving	TBD	$ 80,000
46-Road-County	County of Tehama	Local/Regional	Bowman Road Right of Way Thin	TBD	TBD
47-Road-County	County of Tehama	Local/Regional	VMT and CRP Future Projects	TBD	TBD
48-Road-County	County of Tehama	Local/Regional	Safe Streets and Roads Future Projects	TBD	TBD
49-Road-County	County of Tehama	Local/Regional	South 99W Corridor Study	TBD	TBD
50-Road-County	County of Tehama	Local/Regional	99W Between Solana and County Line in the City of Corning	TBD	TBD
51-Road-County	County of Tehama	Local/Regional	Feasibility Study: Lake California Drive	TBD	TBD
52-Road-County	County of Tehama	Local/Regional	Lake California Drive Intersection at Bowman, South Main, and I-5.	TBD	TBD
Long Range Total					**$ 290,184,797**
Tribal Projects - Long Range					
01-Road-Tribal	County of Tehama	FLAP	Left turn Lane on 99 near proposed new Community Center and	2040	$ -
01-Road-Tribal	County of Tehama	HSIP/Local	Bridge on Orchard Ave crossing Brannin Creek	2040	$ -
01-Road-Tribal	County of Tehama	HSIP/Local	Glarescreen / fence between Everett Freeman Way and I-5	2040	$ -
01-Road-Tribal	County of Tehama	HSIP/Local	Lighting on Liberal Ave Interchange and lighting along 99 near	2040	$ -
01-Road-Tribal	County of Tehama	HSIP/Local	A secondary I5 access at Sour Grass Road	2040	$ -
Long Range Total					**$ -**
Short Range Total					**$ 97,368,711**
Long Range Total					**$ 333,932,597**

Table 4.2

BRIDGE PROJECTS

Project Number (Local)	Funding Source	Description	CON Year	Cost in CON Year (@13.4%)
City of Red Bluff - Short Range				
01-Bridge-RB	HBP	Baker Road Bridge @ Brickyard Creek	2030	$ 3,085,264
Total				**$ 3,085,264**
County of Tehama - Short Range				
03-Bridge-County	HBP	McCoy Low Water Crossing and approaches	2030	$ 17,856,976
06-Bridge-County	HBP	Flores Ave @ Oat Creek	2030	$ 10,484,160
07-Bridge-County	HBP, Toll Credits	Lowrey Road @ SF Elder Creek	2030	$ 3,009,632
08-Bridge-County	HBP, Toll Credits	Tyler Road @ Oat Creek	2030	$ 2,608,000
09-Bridge-County	HBP, Toll Credits	Shasta Blvd @ NF Mill Creek	2030	$ 5,216,000
10-Bridge-County	HBP, Toll Credits	Mt. Shasta Ave @ NF Hall Creek	2030	$ 2,608,000
Total				**$ 41,782,768**
County of Tehama - Long Range				
45-Bridge-County	HBP, Toll Credits	Bowman Road @ Pine Creek	2045	$ 3,948,000
46-Bridge-County	HBP, Toll Credits	Bowman Road @ Mitchell	2045	$ 3,948,000
11-Bridge-County	HBP, Toll Credits	Reeds Creek RD @ Brush Creek	2045	$ 3,158,400
12-Bridge-County	HBP, Toll Credits	Tuscan Springs RD @ Salt Creek	2045	$ 3,395,280
13-Bridge-County	HBP, Toll Credits	Butte Mtn RD @ Elmore Creek	2045	$ 3,711,120
14-Bridge-County	HBP, Toll Credits	Vestal Road @ Coldfork Cottonwood CRK	2045	$ 2,052,960
15-Bridge-County	HBP, Toll Credits	Kansas AVE @ Antelope CREEK	2045	$ 3,592,680
16-Bridge-County	HBP, Toll Credits	Vestal Road @ South Fork Cottonwood CR	2045	$ 7,027,440
17-Bridge-County	HBP, Toll Credits	Belle Mill RD @ Paynes Creek Slough	2045	$ 28,425,600
18-Bridge-County	HBP, Toll Credits	Briggs Road @ Red Bank Creek	2045	$ 6,987,960
19-Bridge-County	HBP, Toll Credits	Red Bank RD @ Vale Gulch	2045	$ 2,092,440
20-Bridge-County	HBP, Toll Credits	Pine Creek RD @ Pine Creek	2045	$ 2,842,560
21-Bridge-County	HBP, Toll Credits	Rawson Road @ Willow Creek	2045	$ 3,079,440
22-Bridge-County	HBP, Toll Credits	99W @ Red Bank Creek	2045	$ 18,200,280
23-Bridge-County	HBP, Toll Credits	Belle Mill RD @ Samson Slough	2045	$ 22,740,480
24-Bridge-County	HBP, Toll Credits	Willard RD @ Branch of Reeds Creek	2045	$ 1,895,040
25-Bridge-County	HBP, Toll Credits	Kirkwood Road @ Jewett Creek	2045	$ 4,974,480
26-Bridge-County	HBP, Toll Credits	Ohio AVE @ Jewett Creek	2045	$ 3,711,120
27-Bridge-County	HBP, Toll Credits	Johnson Rd @ Reeds Creek	2045	$ 3,671,640

Project Number (Local)	Funding Source	Description	CON Year	Cost in CON Year (@13.4%)
28-Bridge-County	HBP, Toll Credits	Kelly Rd @ Mccarty Creek	2045	$ 1,816,080
29-Bridge-County	HBP, Toll Credits	Rawson Rd @ Burch Creek	2045	$ 4,619,160
30-Bridge-County	HBP, Toll Credits	Rawson Rd @ Jackson Creek	2045	$ 1,421,280
31-Bridge-County	HBP, Toll Credits	Hall Rd @ West Burch Creek	2045	$ 4,737,600
32-Bridge-County	HBP, Toll Credits	Osborn Rd @ Mill Creek Branch	2045	$ 1,579,200
33-Bridge-County	HBP, Toll Credits	Rawson Rd @ South Fork Jewett Creek	2045	$ 2,368,800
34-Bridge-County	HBP, Toll Credits	South AVE @ Sacramento Riv Ovrflow #1	2045	$ 3,987,480
35-Bridge-County	HBP, Toll Credits	Lowrey Road @ Vale Gulch	2045	$ 2,092,440
36-Bridge-County	HBP, Toll Credits	Rawson Road @ Hall Creek Branch	2045	$ 1,816,080
37-Bridge-County	HBP, Toll Credits	Wildcat Road @ North Fork Battle Creek	2045	$ 9,396,240
38-Bridge-County	HBP, Toll Credits	Tehama Ave @ Corning Canal	2045	$ 2,961,000
39-Bridge-County	HBP, Toll Credits	Manton Rd @ South Fork Battle Creek	2045	$ 11,370,240
40-Bridge-County	HBP, Toll Credits	South 99W @ Moore Creek	2045	$ 6,000,960
41-Bridge-County	HBP, Toll Credits	Chase Ave @ Hall Creek	2045	$ 3,671,640
42-Bridge-County	HBP, Toll Credits	Moller Avenue @ Moller Slough	2045	$ 1,381,800
43-Bridge-County	HBP, Toll Credits	Ridge Road @ Branch Of Red Bank Creek	2045	$ 1,263,360
44-Bridge-County	HBP, Toll Credits	Newville Rd @ Stony Creek	2045	$ 13,620,600
45-Bridge-County	TBD	Woodson Bridge Planning and Replacement	TBD	TBD
Total				**$ 203,558,880**
Short Range Total				**$ 44,868,032**
Long Range Total				**$ 203,558,880**

Table 4.3

TRANSIT PROJECTS

Agency	Project Name	Funding	CON Year	Project Type	Total Cost
TCTC	Transit Operations & Maintenance	LTF, 5311, STA, Farebox	2025-2035	Operations and Maintenance	$ 14,000,000
TCTC	Fleet Replacement	LTF, CMAQ	2025-2035	Fleet Replacement	$ 2,869,900
TCTC	Rio Street Transit Hub Improvements (ZEV infra)	TBD	TBD	Capital Improvements	TBD
TCTC	TRAX Facility Expansion (ZEV infra)	TBD	TBD	Capital Improvements	TBD
Short Range Total					**$ 16,869,900**

Table 4.4

BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PROJECTS

RTP Project Number	Funding Source	Location	Description	CON Year	Cost
City of Corning - Long Range					
01-ATP-Corning	ATP	Olive View School	Olive View School Connectivity Project	2035+	$ 1,200,000
02-ATP-Corning	ATP	West Street School	West Street School Connectivity Project	2035+	$ 1,300,000
03-ATP-Corning	ATP	Woodson School	Woodson School Connectivity Project	2035+	$ 1,500,000
04-ATP-Corning	ATP	Solano Street	Solano Street from Solano (East City Limits) to Old Hwy 99W	2035+	$ -
05-ATP-Corning	ATP		Highway 99W (Colusa to South Ave)	2035+	$ -
06-ATP-Corning	ATP	1st Street	Class 2 Bike Lanes-Blackburn Ave to Fig Lane	2035+	$ 60,000
07-ATP-Corning	ATP	Black Butte Lake	Regional Bike Route-Via Corning Road and Black Butte Lake Road	2035+	$ 70,000
08-ATP-Corning	ATP	Blackburn Avenue	Corridor Improvements-Edith Avenue to Edith Avenue	2035+	$ 950,000
09-ATP-Corning	ATP	Blackburn Moon Drain	Class 1 Bike Path-East to Corona Avenue	2035+	$ 1,100,000
10-ATP-Corning	ATP	Colusa Street	Corridor Improvements-Edith Avenue to Marguerite Avenue	2035+	$ 2,750,000
11-ATP-Corning	ATP	Fig Lane	Corridor Improvements-Houghton Avenue to Marguerite Avenue	2035+	$ 2,000,000
12-ATP-Corning	ATP	Highway 99	Regional Bike Route-South Ave to Gallagher Avenue	2035+	$ 20,000
13-ATP-Corning	ATP	Jewett Creek	Class 1 Bike Path-Highway 99W to Toomes Avenue	2035+	$ 300,000
14-ATP-Corning	ATP	Marguerite Avenue	Crosswalk Enhancements-Fig Lane to Blackburn Avenue	2035+	$ 100,000
15-ATP-Corning	ATP	Rolling Hills Casino	Regional Bike Route-Via Highway 99W and Liberal Avenue	2035+	$ 15,000
16-ATP-Corning	ATP	Solano Street	Streetscape Improvements-Highway 99W to 3rd Street	2035+	$ 7,000,000
17-ATP-Corning	ATP	South Street	Class 2 Bike Lanes-Houghton Avenue to marguerite Avenue	2035+	$ 700,000
18-ATP-Corning	ATP	Toomes Avenue	Corridor Improvements-Fig Lane to Blackburn Avenue	2035+	$ 1,600,000
19-ATP-Corning	ATP	West Street	Class 2 Bike Lanes-Nroth Street to Fig Lane	2035+	$ 250,000
20-ATP-Corning	ATP	Woodson Bridge Rec.	Regional Bike Route-Via Marguerite Avenue and Loleta Avenue	2035+	$ 25,000
Total					**$ 20,940,000**
City of Red Bluff - Long Range					
01-ATP-Red Bluff	ATP	Walnut St.	Walnut St./Monroe Class 2 Bikeway	2035+	$ 500,000
02-ATP-Red Bluff	ATP	Diamond Ave.	Diamond Avenue College Connection	2035+	$ 5,000,000
03-ATP-Red Bluff	ATP	Vista Way	Vista Way Bikeway (South Jackson to Luther Road via Airport Road)	2035+	$ 100,000
04-ATP-Red Bluff	ATP	Sale Lane	Sale Lane Sidewalk/Bike Lane to Sacramento River Discovery Center	2035+	$ 200,000
05-ATP-Red Bluff	ATP	Sale Lane	Lake Red Bluff Bikeway	2035+	$ -
06-ATP-Red Bluff	ATP	Reeds Creek	Reeds Creek River Walk (Washington St. to Paskenta Road)	2035+	$ 2,000,000
07-ATP-Red Bluff	ATP	Johnson St.	Johnson St. Bikeway (Walnut St. to Baker Road via Walbridge St.)	2035+	$ 200,000
08-ATP-Red Bluff	ATP	Vista Way	Vista Way Bikeway (Montgomery Road. to Luther Road via Airport Road)	2035+	$ 100,000
09-ATP-Red Bluff	ATP	Washington St.	Washington St. Bikeway (Willow St. to Walton St.)	2035+	$ 200,000
10-ATP-Red Bluff	ATP	Adobe State Park	Adobe Park Bikeway (Dog Island Park to Ide Adobe State Park)	2035+	$ 3,000,000
11-ATP-Red Bluff	ATP	Adobe Rd.	Adobe Road Bikeway	2035+	$ 3,000,000
Total					**$ 14,300,000**

RTP Project Number	Funding Source	Location	Description	CON Year	Cost
County of Tehama Long Range					
01-ATP-County	ATP	Bowman Rd	Bowman Road Bikeway (Evergreen School to I-5)	2035+	$ 3,000,000
02-ATP-County	ATP	Aramayo Way	Tehama-Los Molinos Bikeway (City of Tehama and Tehama County)	2035+	$ 1,500,000
03-ATP-County	ATP	Baker Rd	Baker Road Bikeway (SR 36 to Walnut St.) (City of Red Bluff and Tehama County)	2035+	$ 3,000,000
04-ATP-County	ATP	Los Molinos Elementary School	Sidewalks, crosswalks, ADA ramps, on E side of Stanford between Grant and Rose.	2035+	$ 500,000
05-ATP-County	ATP	Bowman Rd	Bowman Road Bikeway (Evergreen School to I-5)	2035+	TBD
06-ATP-County	ATP	Aramayo Way	Tehama-Los Molinos Bikeway (City of Tehama and Tehama County)	2035+	TBD
07-ATP-County	ATP	Kirkwood Elementary School	School zone improvements, traffic calming, sign package.	2035+	TBD
08-ATP-County	ATP	Lassen View Elementary	Safety improvements on 99 to mitigate ingress/egress dangers.	2035+	TBD
09-ATP-County	ATP	Bend School	Multi-use path from Ash Lane to Bend School parking lot. Move Driscoll fence line.	2035+	TBD
10-ATP-County	ATP	Bend School	School zone improvements (crosswalks, shoulder widening, parking lot definition.	2035+	TBD
11-ATP-County	ATP	Vina Elemantary	Formalize parking and school zone area. Crosswalks, sign package, rural standard shoulder for peds.	2035+	TBD
12-ATP-County	ATP	Flournoy Elementary School	School zone improvements, striping on Osbourne Rd. signage and formailze transition zone.	2035+	TBD
13-ATP-County	ATP	Gerber Elementary School	Traffic calming and school zone crossing/marking on Chard Avenue.	2035+	TBD
14-ATP-County	ATP	Elkins Elementary School	Multi-use path from school to community center. N.side of Toomes-Wannatoddy to Crane Mill	2035+	TBD
15-ATP-County	ATP	RR Corridor	Railroad Bikeway (Red Bluff to Los Molinos)	2035+	TBD
16-ATP-County	ATP	Baker Rd	Baker Road Bikeway (SR 36 to Walnut St.) (City of Red Bluff and Tehama County)	2035+	TBD
17-ATP-County	ATP	Mineral	Restriping and crosswalks at SR 36 and SR 172	2035+	TBD
Total					**$ 8,000,000**
Long Range Total					**$ 43,240,000**

Table 4.5

AVIATION PROJECTS

Project Name	Funding	CON Year	Intent	Total Cost
City of Red Bluff - Short Range				
Twy Rehab, Main Apron Rehab and Various-Design	AIP, Local	2019	Aviation Improvements	$ 100,000
Helicopter Parking Pads and Apron Expansion - Design	AIP, Local	2020	Aviation Improvements	$ 100,000
Twy Rehabilitation - Construction	AIP, Local	2020	Aviation Improvements	$ 407,000
East-West Taxiway Rehab and Security Upgrade - Design & CatEx	AIP, Local	2021	Aviation Improvements	$ 110,000
Main Apron Pavement Rehabilitation - Construction	AIP, Local	2021	Aviation Improvements	$ 342,000
Apron Expansion - Construction	AIP, Local	2022	Aviation Improvements	$ 1,340,000
Helicopter Parking Pads - Construction	AIP, Local	2022	Aviation Improvements	$ 40,000
East-West Taxiway Rehabilitation - Construction	AIP, Local	2023	Aviation Improvements	$ 147,000
Security Upgrades; Fence, Surveillance - Construction	AIP, Local	2023	Aviation Improvements	$ 35,000
Airport Layout Plan - Update	AIP, Local	2024	Aviation Improvements	$ 175,000
Runway 15-33 Extension - Environmental Documents	AIP, Local	2025	Aviation Improvements	$ 100,000
Runway 15-33 Extension - Design	AIP, Local	2026	Aviation Improvements	$ 150,000
Runway 15-33 Extension - Construction	AIP, Local	2027	Aviation Improvements	$ 650,000
Short Range Total				**$ 3,696,000**
Long Range Total				**$ -**

Table 4.6

SHOPP Project List

Route	Activity Category	Activity Location	CON Year	Total Project Cost
5	Advance Mitigation/Mitigation	In Tehama County near Cottonwood on Route 5 at Cottonwood Creek Bridge and on Route 99 at 0.1 mile north of Toomes Creek Bridge. Cottonwood Toomes Excess Lands Transfer (Mitigation Relinquishment)	2024/25	$ 4,200,000
36	Reactive Safety	Horse Gulch Curve Safety Improvement/In Tehama County about 26 miles west of Red Bluff from 5.3 miles east to 5.8 miles east of Dry Creek Bridge.	2025/26	$ 5,590,000
36	Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure	Mineral Multi-Use Path and Shoulders - In Tehama County at and near Mineral 0.1 mile east of Battle Creek Bridge to 0.3 mile east of Route 172	2025/26	$ 4,126,000
5	Roadside	NB and SB Herbert S. Miles SRRA Well Replacement & Wastewater upgrades	2026/27	$ 7,572,000
32	Reactive Safety	Elam Safety Shoulder Widening - Tehama 32 EB lane	2026/27	$ 5,145,000
36	Bridge	Tehama and Plumas Scour Mitigation	2027/28	$ 6,341,000
99	Reactive Safety	Butler-Taft TW-LTL Legal: IN TEHAMA COUNTY NEAR LOS MOLINOS FROM 0.1 MILE SOUTH OF BUTLER STREET TO 0.3 MILE NORTH OF TAFT STREET.	2027/28	$ 3,722,000
5	Roadside	South Main-Diamond Ave Roadside Rehab Legal: IN TEHAMA COUNTY IN RED BLUFF FROM 0.5 MILE SOUTH OF SOUTH MAIN STREET OVERCROSSING TO 0.3 MILE NORTH OF DIAMOND AVENUE OVERCROSSING.	2028/29	$ 15,138,000
5	Proactive Safety	Install cable barrier in the median of Tehama-5 Legal: In Tehama County In and Near Corning from 0.7 mile north of the Glenn County line to McClure Creek Bridge #08-0074	2028/29	$ 27,183,900
36	Pavement	Mineral Pavement Legal: IN TEHAMA COUNTY AT AND NEAR MINERAL FROM 0.8 MILE WEST OF DIAMOND ROAD TO 0.4 MILE EAST OF MILL CREEK BRIDGE.	2029/30	$ 20,968,000
36	Mobility - TMS	Red Bluff Signals Legal: IN TEHAMA COUNTY IN RED BLUFF AT VARIOUS LOCATIONS FROM WALNUT STREET TO COLONY ROAD	2029/30	$ 9,914,600
5	Pavement	Corning Pavement	2031/32	$ 59,634,000
99	Bridge - Health	Bridge work on TEH 99 and 005, to include, but not limited to, replace Deer Creek Overflow bridge (08-0003) and scour improvements on Sacramento River Bridge (08-0096R).	2031/32	$ 11,680,000
36	Pavement	Ponderosa Way Pavement Teh-36-PM 67.5/R75.10	2032/33	$ 14,791,000
32	Drainage	Drainage on Tehama-32 and Trinity-36	2032/33	$ 3,391,000
Total SHOPP				**$ 199,396,500**